BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08654 101 6

SHELF 758.107 NO.

Given By

W. W. Greenough

De 4'45
657127

2

PAPERS

OF

7586.107

THE SLAVE POWER,

FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE

"BOSTON WHIG."

BY JOHN G. PALFREY,

OF CAMBRIDGE, MIDDLESEX COUNTY, MASSACHUSETTS.

SOLD BY

BOSTON:
MERRILL, COBB & CO.
8 CONGRESS STREET.

From 4392.3—2
201.707
W. H. Greenough.
Aug, 16 1876

CONTENTS.

No. I.—Its Foundation 1

No. II.—Its Place in the Federal Constitution 3

No. III.—First Step forward in the Legislature.—Abolition of Jury Trials for the Question of Personal Liberty 7

No. IV.—Re-inforced with French and Spanish Auxiliaries . . . 9

No. V.—Plot for another Alliance 13

No. VI.—No Outside Row to the Cotton Field 16

No. VII.—Fortified with a Quarter part of Mexico 19

No. VIII.—Objections to Annexation in the Free States.—Counter-Current in Massachusetts 21

No. IX.—Consequences of *Cottoning* to it in the North . . . 24

No. X.—What has the North to do with it?—The North is a Fraction of the Human Race 28

No. XI.—What has the North to do with it?—Business of the North sacrificed 31

No. XII.—What has the North to do with it?—Its influence on the Competency of Voters and Rulers 35

No. XIII.—What has the North to do with it?—Costly and Wicked Wars 38

No. XIV.— What has the North to do with it? — The North defrauded and brow-beaten by its Common Legislation . 42

No. XV.— What has the North to do with it? — Outrages on Northern Citizens 45

No. XVI.— Its Tyranny over the Non-Slaveholders of the South . 50

No. XVII.— It exists by the Sufferance of the Southern Non-Slaveholders 54

No. XVIII.— Who will be harmed by its Overthrow? . . 60

No. XIX.— Who will be harmed by its Overthrow? —Prudential Considerations for the Slave Holder 63

No. XX.— Who will be harmed by its Overthrow? — Economical Considerations for the Slaveholder 66

No. XXI.— Who will be harmed by its Overthrow?— Economical Considerations for the Slaveholder 70

No. XXII.— What should the Free States do about it? . . 75

No. XXIII.— What can the Free States do about it? . . . 80

No. XXIV.— What must the Free States do about it?— What must Massachusetts do? 86

THE SLAVE POWER.

NO. I.

ITS FOUNDATION.

Most New England men, who have talked five minutes with a Virginian, have heard him illustrate the characters of the two races by a reference to their Roundhead and Cavalier origin. He is apt to be under some misapprehension of the facts. Of the Roundhead founders of Massachusetts many were persons of fortune and education, and not a few were of the noble and gentle blood of England. The settlers of Virginia were Cavaliers of that sort of which Wildrake, in Scott's novel of *Woodstock*, is the type and embodiment. "A great part," so says Captain Smith, the man who saved them from self-destruction, "were unruly sparks, packed off by their friends to escape worse destinies at home. Many were poor gentlemen, broken tradesmen, rakes, and libertines, footmen, and such others as were much fitter to spoil and ruin a Commonwealth than to help to raise or maintain one."

These were just the sort of people for slavery to suit. A Dutch ship, in 1620, brought some African slaves into James River, and from that time the importation went on rapidly. The foundation of the domestic institution, and of the social fabric of the South, were laid. When, in 1646, a cargo of Africans were brought from the slave-coast to Boston, the magistrates sent them back, declaring themselves "bound by the first opportunity to bear witness against the heinous and crying sin of man-stealing."* The destiny of New-England was to be different.

The settlement of South Carolina began with negroes from the West Indies, and in a few years their number within her borders was nearly double that of the whites. If to other colonies belonged

* "The General Court, conceiving themselves bound by the first opportunity to bear witness against the heinous and crying sin of man-stealing, as also to prescribe such timely redress for what is past, and such law for the future, as may sufficiently deter all others belonging to us to have to do with such vile and most odious courses, justly abhorred of all good and just men, do order that the negro interpreter and others unlawfully taken, be by the first opportunity (at the charge of the country for the present) sent to their native country, Guinea, and a letter of indignation of the Court thereabouts, desiring our honored Governor would please to put this in execution." [Massachusetts Colony Laws, 1646.] They were so scrupulous as to send and bring back one who had been smuggled down into Maine.

the bad eminence of an earlier introduction of slavery, Georgia claims the still more odious one of superseding with it, after twenty years, the humane institutions of her philanthropic founder. From Virginia slavery easily passed over into North Carolina, Maryland and Delaware. Pennsylvania, after a period of fluctuating policy, finally bounded its progress towards the North. There were slaves indeed in considerable numbers in New York and New Jersey, and some in the Eastern States. But they were principally employed as domestic servants; the hardship of their condition was much mitigated; and they made but an immaterial element in the constitution of Northern society. In May, 1701, Boston instructed its representatives to move to "put a period to negroes being slaves." But the power of the mother country stood in the way. The Constitution of Massachusetts was established in 1780. In 1781, a bill was found in Worcester county against a white man for assaulting and imprisoning a black. It was tried before the Supreme Court in 1783. The defence was, that the black was a slave, and that the act charged was the necessary restraint and correction of the master. But the Court held that under the clause in the Declaration of Rights, that "all men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential and inalienable rights, among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties," there could could be no legal slavery in Massachusetts. The jury thought so too; the master was convicted, and fined forty shillings; and the question was settled for ever.

At the end of the seventeenth century, South Carolina, with the labor of her slaves, produced abundance of the best rice in the world. The profitableness of the bondman of course riveted his chains. Of the humble but excellent men who fled to America from Popish persecution in France, the smaller portions planted themselves in Massachusetts and New York, the largest in South Carolina. The South Carolina emigrants or their children fell into the bad principles and practices of their neighbors; and the representatives of the refugee Huguenots of 1686 were, in 1786, almost the only champions of slavery in the Convention for devising a Constitution to give practical efficacy to the maxims of the Declaration of Independence, that "all men are born free and equal, and have certain inalienable rights."

In 1790, Virginia had 293,427 slaves. The number in the whole United States was less than 700,000. In 1800, there were still not quite 900,000. In 1810, after the acquisition of Louisiana, the census of slaves fell a little short of 1,200,000. In 1820, there were more than 1,500,000; in 1830, more than 2,000,000; in 1840, nearly 2,500,000; and in 1846, the number considerably exceeds 3,000,000, being greater than that of the whole white population of the country at the close of the revolutionary war.

The wickedness and present mischiefs of slavery, and something

of its threatening aspect upon the future, were seen by discerning men before the Federal Union. Mr. Jefferson wrote his "Notes on Virginia" in 1781. "The whole commerce between master and slave," said he,* "is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it: for man is an imitative animal. * * * * * The parent storms; the child looks on; catches the lineaments of wrath; puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves; gives loose to the worst of passions; and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy, who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances. And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one half of the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the *amor patriæ* of the other. * * * * * In a warm climate, no man will labor for himself who can make another labor for him. This is so true, that of the proprietors of slaves a very small proportion indeed are ever seen to labor. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God; that they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep for ever; that, considering numbers, nature, and natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation, is among possible events; that it may become probable by supernatural interference. The Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with us in such a contest."

NO. II.

ITS PLACE IN THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION.

In the Convention for forming a Federal Constitution, questions relating to Slavery could not fail to present themselves with prominence. In the discussions and negotiations to which it gave rise, Virginia, which owned nearly half the slaves in the country, acted a comparatively generous part. Maryland and North Carolina followed her lead. South Carolina, which owned the next most, and Georgia, were moved by other instincts.

Under the old Confederation, when Congress assessed upon the

* Answer to Query 18.

several States the portion which they were respectively to raise of a gross sum of money, and the States proceeded to tax, each its own citizens, the rule of assessment was early made a question. One proposal was, that the States should be taxed in proportion to the value of lands and houses; another, in proportion to the number of inhabitants; another, to the number of white inhabitants; another, that two slaves should count as one freeman. The rule finally adopted was founded on the value of occupied land. The same question occurred again in the Convention for framing the Federal Constitution. Taxation, which was to go hand in hand with representation in the popular branch of the Legislature, was of course to be proportioned to the amount of property. But what was the best practical measure of property as between different States? It was agreed that the amount of population was so. But were slaves, who in our view were human beings, and in another were property like any other stock on a farm, were they, or were they not, to be included in the census, so as to increase the taxes of the States to which they belonged? Here arose a question which it was found could only be settled by both parties yielding something, and at length the principle of an enumeration of three-fifths of the slaves was agreed to.* The constitutional provision accordingly stands thus; "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States, which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."†

This is the famous *Compromise*. Believed by the free States at the time to be comparatively unimportant, because having reference to a merely temporary state of things, it has come to be the lodging-place of the leading policy of the Government, and bids fair to annul the purpose for which the Constitution of the United States of America was declared to be ordained and established; viz: "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty."

Three things are observable as to this most unfortunate measure.

1. It was a compromise in which the free States have received nothing in return for what they yielded; a bargain, in which payment has been made only on one side. The free States agreed to allow a representation for three-fifths of the negroes in the popular branch

* In respect to taxation, this was but a continuation of the plan which had been adopted on the revisal of the terms of confederation in 1783. At that time various plans were brought forward for including slaves in the census of persons, as part of the basis of taxation. Different proposals were made to enumerate slaves, in the proportion of four as equivalent to three freemen; four to one; two to one; and three to two. The proposition of five to three was finally agreed to, on the motion of Mr. Madison.

† Art. 1, § 2.

of the national Legislature, in consideration of taxes being paid by the Slave States in the same proportion. But, as things have turned out, they have received no *quid* for their enormous *quo*. It was expected that the government would be supported, in great part at least, by direct taxation. But a better revenue policy was immediately adopted. The government has been almost wholly maintained by the duties on imported articles, aided by the comparatively small income from the sales of the public lands. No direct tax has been levied except towards the close of the war of 1812, and a tax of two millions in 1798. The constitutional provision, so far as it went to compensate the Free States for the sacrifice they made, is a dead letter. The Slave States have enjoyed their purchase, and have not paid its price.

2. It was expected by both parties to prove a merely temporary arrangement. The institution to which it related, was believed to be doomed. Georgia and South Carolina, in their small way, did not give up the idea of holding on to slavery, but the whole current of opinion in the more considerable States was the other way. Accordingly, the word *slave* or *slavery* is not used in the Constitution, either in the *compromise* article, or in the only other provision in which the institution is referred to, that for the restoration of fugitives. The Constitution was not allowed to record the word, because it was understood that the thing was soon to perish, and the Constitution ought not to enshrine its detestable memory. It was a great question in the Convention, whether and when the Federal Government should have power to abolish the foreign Slave Trade. The arrangement finally fixed on was, that it might abolish that trade in 1808. Every one who reads the debates on the subject, sees that the speakers regarded the questions of the cessation of the foreign Slave Trade, and the cessation of Slavery in the United States, as substantially one and the same, as differing only in the particular that, in point of time, one would be a little in advance of the other.

3. No one dreamed that even for the short time the arrangement was expected to last, it was to have any application except to the original thirteen States. It was felt to be a very hard bargain for the free States, any way. Governeur Morris, of Pennsylvania, said in the Convention, that "he would sooner submit himself to a tax for paying for all the negroes in the United States, than saddle posterity with such a Constitution." "He never would concur in upholding domestic slavery. It was a nefarious institution." "The admission of slaves into the representation, when fairly explained, comes to this, that the inhabitant of Georgia and South Carolina who goes to the coast of Africa, and in defiance of the most sacred laws of humanity, tears away his fellow-creatures from their dearest connexions, and damns them to the most cruel bondage, shall have more votes in a government instituted for protection of the rights of mankind, than the citizen of Pennsylvania or New Jersey, who

views with a laudable horror so nefarious a practice."* But no one imagined that other communities, beyond the then existing bounds of the States, were to come in and claim a share in the agreement. The delegates from the free States saw the evil and sacrifice to be enormous. But they thought they saw to the bottom of it. Their posterity have reason to know that they were grievously mistaken.

The opinions that prevailed respecting the short duration of the evil that had been assented to, appear in the debates of the State Conventions for adopting the Constitution. Judge Dawes said, in the Massachusetts Convention, "it would not do to abolish slavery by an act of Congress, in a moment, and so destroy what our Southern brethren consider as property. But we may say, that although slavery is not smitten by an apoplexy, yet it has received a mortal wound, and will die of a consumption."† "After the year 1808," said Mr. Wilson, in the Pennsylvania Convention, "the Congress will have power to prohibit the importation of slaves, notwithstanding the disposition of any State to the contrary. I consider this as laying the foundation for banishing slavery out of this country; and, though the period is more distant than I could wish, yet it will produce the same kind, gradual change, which was produced in Pennsylvania. * * * * * In the mean time, the new States which are to be formed, will be under the control of Congress in this particular; and slaves will never be introduced among them."‡ On the other hand, the doctrine that the general government had no power over the institution of slavery in the States, was unknown in those times. In the Convention, the South Carolina and Georgia gentlemen clamored for the clause containing the denial of such a power.§ But it was steadily denied them. "There is no clause in the Constitution," said Mr. George Mason in the Virginia Convention, "that will prevent the northern and eastern States from meddling with our whole property in slaves. There is a clause to prohibit the importation of slaves after twenty years, but there is no provision made for securing to the Southern States those they now possess. * * * * * There ought to be a clause in the Constitution to secure us that property, which we have acquired under our former laws, and the loss of which would bring ruin on a great many people."‖ Patrick Henry "asked, why it was omitted to secure us that property in slaves, which we held now? He feared its omission was done with design. They might lay such heavy taxes on slaves, as would amount to emancipation. * * * * * * Imposts (or duties) and excises, were to be uniform. But this uniformity did not extend to taxes. This might compel the Southern States to liberate their negroes. He wished this property therefore to be guarded."¶ In a debate in

* Madison papers, 1263, &c.
† Elliot's Debates, vol. i. p. 60.
‡ Ibid. vol. iii. pp. 250, 251.
§ Madison, 1187, 1447.
‖ Elliot's Debates, vol. ii. p. 212.
¶ Ibid. p. 337.

the Federal House of Representatives, in March, 1790, on the presentation of a memorial of the Quakers on the slave-trade, Mr. Madison "adverted to the Western country, and the cession of Georgia, in which Congress have certainly the power to regulate the subject of slavery, which shows that gentlemen are mistaken in supposing that Congress cannot constitutionally interfere in the business in any degree whatever."

NO. III.

FIRST STEP FORWARD IN THE LEGISLATURE. — ABOLITION OF JURY TRIALS FOR THE QUESTION OF PERSONAL LIBERTY.

Every person in the United States is the subject of two governments; and it is remarkable how different his political relations are, according as he is regarded as belonging to the one or the other. We, of this Commonwealth, considered as the people of Massachusetts, are free citizens of an excellently constituted republic. Considered as people of the United States, we, with the rest of the so-called free people, both of the free and of the slave States, amounting to some eighteen millions in number, are subjects of an oligarchy of the most odious possible description; an oligarchy composed of about one hundred thousand owners of men.* There are perhaps three hundred thousand slaveholders in the country. Allowing for minors and women, probably not far from one-third of the number are voters; and they administer our affairs.

The quiet and steady process by which this rather material change in the character of the Federal Government was brought about, is not more remarkable than the result. Never was it better shown what great things union, perseverance, and impudence will do.

It is often wisdom, in the prosecution of a scheme, to put forth a thoroughly outrageous proposal at the beginning. If it is disallowed, and cannot be carried, you fall back on something less exorbitant, which then has an air of moderation and compromise. If on the other hand you succeed to carry it, your boldness, and the facile surrender of the other party, make a capital *prestige* for the future.

Four years had not passed after the Federal Constitution went into operation, before the Southern States tried the virtue of this policy, and tried it with an easy success, that must have amazed themselves at the time, and has not been lost upon their subsequent

* Possibly this estimate may be too small. But, on the other hand, it is made on an estimate of three hundred thousand as the whole number of slave-owners, which many considered to be too high by fifty thousand. The number of slave-holding voters ought by all means to be ascertained in the census of 1850. We shall then be able to reason more closely on the matter.

proceedings. On the 12th day of February, 1793, Congress enacted a law to carry into effect the provision of the Constitution respecting the delivering up of persons "held to labor in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another." This law, which is still in force, provides that

"When a person held to labor in any of the United States, or in either of the territories on the northwest, or south of the river Ohio, under the laws thereof, shall escape into any other of the said States or territory, the person to whom such labor or service may be due, his agent or attorney, is hereby empowered to seize or arrest such fugitive from labor, and to take him or her before any judge of the Circuit or District Courts of the United States, residing or being within the State, or before any magistrate of a county, city, or town corporate, wherein such seizure or arrest shall be made, and upon proof to the satisfaction of such judge or magistrate, either by oral testimony or affidavit, taken before and certified by a magistrate of any such State or territory, that the person so seized or arrested doth, under the laws of the State or territory from which he or she fled, owe service or labor to the person claiming him or her, it shall be the duty of such judge or magistrate to give a certificate thereof to such claimant, his agent or attorney, which shall be sufficient warrant for removing the said fugitive from labor to the State or territory from which he or she fled."

If my neighbor sues me for twenty-one dollars, I have a right to carry the question to a jury. The Constitution has declared that I am entitled to better protection against an unjust claim to that amount, than what might be found in the wisdom or integrity of any town or county magistrate. Not so with my liberty, which I care more for than I do for twenty-one dollars. Let a stranger appear and say that he comes from a distant State, where man holds fellow-men in bondage, and let him persuade a stupid justice of the peace, or bribe a base one, to declare that I am the stranger's runaway slave, and there is no lawful power in Massachusetts to save me from being conveyed away in handcuffs, and sold in Washington or New Orleans under the whip. Armed with a paltry justice's warrant, he shall take my wife from my side, or my infant from its cradle, and if I offer resistance, he is clothed with the whole power of the country to strike me down. Do not say that the thing would be prevented, the justice's warrant to the contrary notwithstanding. Very likely it would. But, if prevented, it would have to be by club law, which is not the kind of dependence that we, the law-abiding people of Massachusetts, approve or like to resort to. Do not say that it is not likely any justice of the peace will be cheated into doing such a wrong. Justices of the peace are not all Solomons. There are Justice Shallows even in Massachusetts, and those, too, with whom a dark complexion makes a bad *primâ facie* case. Do not say that justices are always above bribery. There was a story in 1843 that a representative sold his vote, and with it the administration of the Commonwealth for the year, for a suit of clothes; and Governor Morton tossed him a justice's commission into the bargain. Do not say, that it is not likely such treatment of a white freeman will be attempted. *There is the law;* and if they are not often so treated, it is no thanks to their own prudence

or self-respect. *There is the law*; it says nothing of color; and by it the Governor of Massachusetts is just as liable to be carried away and sold in the Southern shambles, as the blackest or least considerable citizen in the Commonwealth. The law may be, for white people, as helpless as it is insolent; but it threatens and insults Harrison Gray Otis as much as his boot-black; George Putnam, of Roxbury, as much as his respectable namesake, of a different complexion, in School street. Do not say that it is not likely black freemen will be often treated in this way. If the blacks had a fair chance to tell their own story in Pennsylvania, we should know, better than we now do, how true that statement would be. At all events, the free States owe it to their good faith to their own citizens, to their decent standing before the world, to their tolerable credit with posterity, to protect their citizens against being carried away as slaves, and to protect the liberty of the humblest citizen as effectually as of the most exalted. Did ever a decent government before decline that duty? Is there any parallel to this monstrous law on the statute book of any civilized people? Did any free government, civilized or not, ever before consent that its constituents should hold their liberty by such a tenure? Did bloated arrogance ever before make such a claim on freemen? Did freemen ever before give up their securities, and agree to a gross affront, with so easy a compliance?

Three years ago, Massachusetts took this thing in hand. But the remedy she applied was necessarily an altogether imperfect one. It does not touch the power to grant warrants, given by the Act of Congress to the Circuit and District Courts, and to town and county magistrates. She made it hazardous for her own justices to do this dirty work. But she could not take from them the power vested by the United States law; and should any one of them, through ignorance or for a sufficient consideration, lend himself to a kidnapper's job, his warrant would be valid against all the world. Such are the legal safeguards of liberty, in "Columbia, happy land."

NO. IV.

RE-INFORCED WITH FRENCH AND SPANISH AUXILIARIES.

The free States were tractable; they had proved themselves so in the measures which have been referred to. The slave States were ambitious. They became avaricious too. New articles of culture were introduced; labor became more valuable; the price of slaves rose; and the power to hold on to them became of more consideration. In the convention, South Carolina and Georgia had in-

sisted that the slave trade should not be prohibited for twenty years, within which time they expected to be able to supply themselves sufficiently. They made good use of their reprieve, and got pretty well provided before it was out. But meanwhile a vast interest was growing up, requiring an immensely increased supply for the southern country. Virginia was now to have her harvest. Her tobacco land was exhausted, but her human stock was fruitful. The foreign competition being destroyed by the prohibition of the African trade, the domestic market prospered. Virginia became the Guinea coast of America.

Rice, introduced into South Carolina in 1693, was the first important staple of the extreme south; the average annual quantity exported from that State in the last years before the Revolution was one hundred and forty-two thousand barrels. Indigo was introduced from the West Indies in 1741 or 1742, and became the most profitable article of cultivation, the annual export before the Revolution amounting to more than a million of pounds. At the end of about forty years more, some experiments were made in the culture of cotton, little suspected then of being destined to be for so long a time the preponderating element in American politics. In 1783, just after the peace, eight bales of cotton were seized by the custom house at Liverpool, it not being believed that America could raise so large a quantity of that product. In 1789, the cotton crop of the United States (that is, substantially, of South Carolina and Georgia) amounted to a million of pounds; in 1801, to nearly fifty millions; in 1811 (Louisiana having been purchased meanwhile), to eighty millions; in 1821, to a hundred and eighty millions; in 1831, to three hundred and eighty-five millions; and at the present time it is not less than a thousand millions, being considerably more than that of all the rest of the world together. The inferior cotton of the south-west sold in 1818 at thirty-five and forty cents a pound. Slaves, the makers of cotton, of course rose in value with what they raised. The aggregate value of slaves in the southern States was estimated by Mr. Gerry in 1790 at ten millions of dollars.* Within a few years Mr. Clay has estimated it at twelve hundred millions. Justice and liberty, it was clear, would have to maintain themselves against fearful odds. The South Carolina coinage of blood to drachmas was a magnificent reality. The Virginian philanthropy of abolition, so vivid in 1787, had become as a dream when one awaketh.

Such an interest coveted more securities than the Constitution gave it. Such an element of political power was tempting to enterprise, and asked for more practical expansion. Two votes in the Federal Senate for a new Slave State, three freemen's votes, in constituting the Federal House of Representatives, for every five human cattle, these were mighty means for consolidating the slave

* Elliot's Debates, vol. iv. part 2, p. 214.

despotism, and subordinating to it the future policy and patronage of the country.

In the session of Congress of 1810–1811, a measure of the boldest character was resorted to. A bill was introduced "to enable the people of the territory of Orleans to form a Constitution and State Government, and for the admission of such State into the Union." The period was one of extreme and passionate agitation. The public mind had been intensely plied with ultra theories, and with sympathy in the amazing struggles of Europe. It was a time little favorable to calm adherence to principles, and consideration of remote consequences. The Slave States moved in solid column, and dictated to a large party at the North. The Constitution provided that "new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union." In vain was it urged, that, from the language of the rest of the section, it was unavoidable to understand this provision as applicable only to territory within the old States, the original parties to the Constitution. In vain was it insisted that, while other powers had been withheld from Congress with so much jealousy by the thirteen States, parties to the compact, it never could have been the intention to invest that legislature with a prerogative so enormous as that of admitting other partners at will, to introduce new elements, interests, and responsibilities, and change the proportions of power among the old ones. Mr. Jefferson, not personally over-scrupulous, but affected by his responsibility before the world, avowed that there was no power in the Constitution to carry out his measure, and desired that, for its ratification, an amendment might be obtained, through the forms constitutionally prescribed.* But the compunctions of trickery and the resistance of patriotism were alike to no purpose. With the help of its duped or designing allies at the North, Slavery was in power, and, as it had its fervid will, it had its easy way. The French and Spanish colony of Louisiana, with its breeds of all tongues and all mixtures, became a member of the Federal Union, with seats for its slave representation in actuality, and the prospect of an indefinite enlargement of it in future; and a principle was established, equally ready for application, as future circumstances might permit, to Texas, Guatemala, Algiers, or Mozambique. And this under the forms of the Constitution! Imagine the statesmen and people of Massachusetts in 1787, descendants of English Commonwealth's-men, fresh from the fields of cis-altantic freedom, to which they had sent one soldier in every three, im-

* "When I consider that the limits of the United States are precisely fixed by the treaty of 1783, and that the Constitution expressly declares itself to be made for the *United States*, I cannot help believing the intention was not to permit Congress to admit into the Union new States which should be formed out of the territory, for which, and under whose authority alone, they were then acting. I do not believe it was meant that they might receive England, Ireland, Holland, &c. into it." Letter to Wilson C. Nicholas, Sept. 7th 1803. "Memoir, Correspondence, and Miscellanies." Vol. iv. p. 3. See also letter to Levi Lincoln of August 30, 1803. Ibid. p. 1.

agine them agreeing to an instrument understood to include any power to bring a rout of vagabond West-Indian Frenchmen and Spaniards, slaves and all, into their grave confederacy.

Ten years later drew the curtain for act the second. Things were ripe in 1820 for another push of the ever prompt and watchful Slave Power. Mr. Monroe's administration was popular. The Federal party had broken down at the close of the war. The returning prosperity of the country had turned the mind of the inventive and quiet North to industry and gain, while the political ambition of the South never lost sight of its purposes. Conciliation was the order of day, and conciliation, with the South, always means complete sacrifice on the other part. The ordinance of 1787, passed when almost all the States were honest, and excluding slavery forever from the region between the Ohio and the Mississippi, had established the dominion of freedom in the new States down to the thirty-seventh degree of North latitude. But the purchase of Louisiana was to be put to yet better use. The patriotic party in Congress stood for the safe-guards of the federal compact, and insisted that Missouri should not be admitted as a partner in the Union with a constitution which, by recognizing slavery, should break down the compromises of the original partnership. Considering the tone of the times, and the comparative union and discipline of the two parties, the battle for liberty was not ill fought. The issue was doubtful for a while, and the right did all but prevail. But Mr. Clay put in with one of his compromises. Slavery entrenched itself anew in the West, up to forty degrees and a half, a little higher than the latitude of Philadelphia. Two more votes were secured for slavery in the Senate, and a further representation in the other House, with a prospect of indefinite extension in future, as long as the vast tracts of the French purchase should hold out to be parcelled and peopled. New England votes — yes, three votes from Massachusetts — helped to do the deed. Pertinently, albeit *im*pertinently, did John Randolph say in the debate on that occasion, "we do not govern them [the people of the North,] by our black slaves, but by their own white slaves. We know what we are doing. We have conquered you once, and we can, and we will, conquer you again. Ay, Sir, we will drive you to the wall, and when we have you there once more, we mean to keep you there, and nail you down, like base money."

When one reads in the Convention for forming the Constitution, and in the State Conventions for its adoption, how undoubting was the expectation, that under the effect of its principles and provisions slavery was soon to die, and how little it was dreamed by the people of that day, that it was ever to be an active element in the politics of the country, it tasks the imagination to conceive how they would have looked, had they been told that in the first sixty years it should have so possessed itself of the Government, that during only twelve years a President from the free States had been tolerated, that a

vast majority of the high offices in all departments, including nearly three-fourths of the offices in the army and navy, had been held by slave-owners, that slavery had been the great dictator of its policy, foreign and domestic, and that at this moment none but slaveholders were ministers of the nation at any foreign court, though there are more than three millions of voters in the country, and only one hundred thousand of them hold slaves.

NO. V.

PLOT FOR ANOTHER ALLIANCE.

Texas, as now claimed, with the Rio Grande for its boundary from the mouth to the source, according to the map published by order of Congress, embraces an area of about three hundred and fifty thousand square miles, a territory more than half as large again as that of France, and enough to divide into forty-five States, each of the size of Massachusetts. What will be the boundary claimed next week, we can better tell when next week comes.

The story of the nefarious proceedings of the Slave Power to strengthen itself with this immense acquisition is all recent, but events have trodden on each other's heels so close that the later have kept driving the earlier out of mind. It is therefore worth while very briefly to recapitulate some of the principal.

In 1821, the year of the erection of Missouri into a State, Mexico became independent of Old Spain. In 1824, in the honest spirit of her new liberty, she decreed a prospective manumission of slaves. This was followed in 1829 by an immediate and complete emancipation, a measure which was shortly afterwards ratified for itself by the Province of Texas.

The vigilant South was moved. A people of freemen on the South-Western border; what an example! A sparsely peopled and productive country; what a prize for the lacklands! what a market for human chattels! what an ally for the Slave Power!

The fact was no sooner known than Mr. Benton, under the signatures of "Americanus" and "La Salle," broached the scheme of *annexation* in the Missouri newspapers, and his essays were briskly circulated through the Slave States. He urged, 1. The importance of providing new securities for the slave interest in the national councils; 2. The necessity of opening a new field for slave cultivation, and a new market for men; 3. The insecurity and depreciation of slave property incident to the contiguity of a free republic.

President Jackson immediately instructed Mr. Poinsett, then minister in Mexico, to make proposals for the purchase of Texas, authorising him to bid for it as high as $4,000,000 or even $5,000,000; "so strong," wrote Mr. Van Buren, Secretary of State, "is the President's conviction of the importance and even necessity" of the acquisition. Mexico was now reduced to great straits in the war for the maintenance of her independence, and the Envoy was accordingly informed that "the present moment is regarded by us as an auspicious one to secure the cession." She was plied at the same time with menaces for delay in settling some pecuniary claims, and for alleged wrong to some Americans who had been ordered from one of the ports into the interior on an alarm of a Spanish invasion; and she was informed that no treaty of commerce would ever be made without a stipulation on her part for the restoration of fugitive slaves. She however declined the bribe, and withstood the threats. Mr. Anthony Butler succeeded Mr. Poinsett in the mission, and from time so time, through six years, renewed the attempt at a bargain, but with no better success than his predecessor.

Such a process was too slow, without being at all certain either. A surer card was playing all the while. Early in 1830, it was announced in Arkansas "on authority entitled to the highest credit [hinted to be that of the American embassy], that no hopes need be entertained of acquiring Texas, until some other party, more friendly to the United States, shall predominate in Mexico, and perhaps not till Texas shall throw off the yoke of allegiance to that government, which they will do no doubt [that is, if we of the South-West can make them] as soon as they shall have a reasonable pretext for so doing. At present they are probably subject to as few impositions and exactions as any people under the sun." In the same year, General Samuel Houston, formerly Governor of Tennessee, and an intimate friend of President Jackson, betook himself to Texas, and a Louisiana paper gave out that he "had gone to raise a revolution," and that we might expect "shortly to hear of his raising his flag." The conspiracy of the Slave Power against an unoffending neighbor, entitled to sympathy by every claim except that she was consistent in her profession of attachment to free principles, went busily to work. Strong facts have been produced to prove that the strings were pulled by President Jackson and his club at Washington. But that question is not material to the present purpose. Slavery was the conspirator, whether Jackson and his intimates were more or less its agents. So confident was the General of getting the country one way or another, that, according to Mr. Hunt, the Texan envoy, "he tendered the office of Governor of the Territory to the late Governor H. G. Burton, of North Carolina, to be entered upon as soon as the treaty of cession should be completed."*

To get up an insurrection in Texas to serve as a pretence for inva-

* Letter to Mr. Forsyth, of Sept. 12th, 1837.

sion, did not seem a very easy thing; but generally where there is an intense will, there may sooner or later be found a way. Discontent, for any or for no cause, was fomented among the American colonists, who, as early as 1821, had been brought in by S. T. Austin, under a contract with the government. Butler, the United States Chargé d'Affaires at Mexico, was conspicuously busy in exciting a disturbance. Among the causes of complaint at last produced were, the union of Coahuila with Texas as one State; the establishment of Custom Houses, at the expiration of the privilege granted to the colonists of exemption from the payment of duties for two years; the establishment of *centralism* in the place of the Federal Constitution in 1824,—on all accounts a judicious measure under the circumstances, and one fairly called for and adopted by a majority of the nation; the failure "to secure, on a firm basis, the right of trial by jury,"—a departure from its own system of jurisprudence, which it does not appear that the government had ever authorised the Texan colonists to expect, but which, in point of fact, it had suffered them to enjoy; a harsh course of administration on the part of the military commandants; and a disallowance of the exercise of any but the Catholic religion,—a rule to which the colonists had expressly consented as the absolute condition of their receiving their lands, but which had in fact not been enforced.

In December, 1835, a declaration of independence was adopted at La Bahia or Goliad, by about ninety persons, not pretending to act in any representative capacity, and all of them Americans, to judge from their names, except two. In March, 1836, by their recommendation a convention of delegates met at a place called Washington, and issued a more formal declaration, to which were subscribed forty-four names, of which three or four appear to have been those of Mexicans. "For a portion of the force [to fight Mexico] we must look," wrote Houston, "to the United States. It cannot come too soon." Of course he did not look in vain, nor were the Campbells long in coming. In defiance of the faith of treaties, without interruption from the government, military expeditions were openly prepared, and proceeded by land and water from the United States, the means being collected at public meetings assembled by advertisements in the newspapers. In New Orleans and other Southern cities, parties with flags, drums and fifes, beat up for recruits about the streets. Troops under General Gaines were ordered by the President over the Texan frontier, *to keep watch upon the Indians.* In April was fought the battle of San Jacinto, in which, it has been asserted on good authority, only fifty men out of the eight hundred of the victorious party had ever had any thing to do with Texas till they went thither in martial array.* Fifteen-sixteenths were freebooters, fresh from the United States.

Texas was wrested from Mexico. So far there was an open field

* North American Review, vol. xliii. p. 254.

for further operations. Our government lost no time in acknowledging her independence. A Resolution to that effect, presently introduced by Mr. Walker, Senator from Mississippi, was passed in March, 1837.

NO. VI.

NO OUTSIDE ROW TO THE COTTON FIELD.

After the defeat of Santa Anna, the parties concerned were naturally impatient for the next move. Texas, with General Houston of Tennessee and General Hamilton of South Carolina in charge of its affairs, applied for admission into the Federal Union in the summer of 1837. But the fruit was not yet ripe. The Northern Democrats were not yet whipped in. Mr. Van Buren saw that the thing would not do, for never did fingers feel the pulse of the nation with so delicate a touch as did those of the Northern man with Southern principles. A war with Mexico too would cost money, while the finances were in a state of utter disorder, and specie payments had been suspended by the banks. Accordingly, Mr. Forsyth replied to the Texan envoy, in an edifying strain of public morality, that "the question of the annexation of a foreign independent State to the United States had never before been presented to this government," and that "powerful and weighty as were the inducements mentioned by General Hunt, they were light when opposed in the scale of reason to treaty obligations, and respect for that integrity of character by which the United States had sought to distinguish themselves."

The saying of a member of Congress that President Tyler's was a *parenthetical* administration, which might be taken away without injury to the sense, was as indefensible as it was witty. On the contrary, it was the distinction of that foul administration to stain the American annals with the blackest blot they ever bore. After the retirement of Mr. Webster in March 1843, and the death of Mr. Legaré, Mr. Upshur of Virginia was placed in July in the Department of State. The acquisition of Texas had been one of Mr. Upshur's long-cherished dreams. As far back as 1829, he had said in the Virginia Convention, "The value of slaves, as an article of property, depends much on the state of the market abroad. If it should be our lot to acquire the country of Texas, their price will rise." He was not known to the nation, except as having been selected by Duff Green to be the editor of the Southern Review, had he succeeded in reviving that work to be the champion of the slaveholders' policy.

Mr. Upshur was killed by the Peace-Maker in the following February, and it then first became known how the seven months of his administration had been occupied. With his recreant master he had been busy from the first moment in concocting a plot, the danger of which the honest part of the nation fondly flattered themselves had passed by, and in profound secresy they had nursed it almost to maturity. Professing to have been informed by a private letter from a citizen of Maryland, then in London, — which letter, when afterwards called for by the Senate from Mr. Secretary Calhoun, was not to be found, — that a person, "deputed by the abolitionists of Texas to negotiate with the British government, had seen Lord Aberdeen and submitted his *projet* for the abolition of slavery in Texas," and that "Lord Aberdeen had agreed that the British government would guaranty the payment of the interest" on a loan for this purpose, "upon condition that the Texan government would abolish slavery," he wrote (August 8th) to the American Chargé in Texas, re-opening the question of annexation which had apparently been closed by Mr. Van Buren six years before. He represented that "the establishment, in the very midst of our slaveholding States, of an independent government, forbidding the existence of slavery, and by a people born, for the most part, among us, reared in our habits, and speaking our language, could not fail to produce the most unhappy effects upon both parties. If Texas were in that condition, her territory would afford a ready refuge for the fugitive slaves of Louisiana and Arkansas, and would hold out to them an encouragement to run away." And in civil diplomatic phrase, he threatened the two-penny new nation with war, should it persist in the purpose to have all its people free. "It is not to be supposed that a people conscious of the power to protect themselves would long submit to such a state of things. They would assume the right to reclaim their slaves by force, and for that purpose would invade the territory of Texas."

It was in vain that Lord Aberdeen, when the subject was presented to him by Mr. Everett, disavowed in the most explicit terms all participation by the British government in any such transaction as had been charged. In October, Mr. Upshur formally proposed to Mr. Van Zandt, the Texan Chargé at Washington, to obtain powers from his government to negotiate a treaty of annexation. The Texan people meanwhile had bolted a little from the track. They were irritated by the rejection of their former proposals, and, encouraged by the long supineness of Mexico, they had begun to think they might do as well to set up for themselves. As late as January, 1844, Mr. Upshur had still on hand the work of supplicating and bullying them into a consent to be annexed.

He wheedled them hard, in his letter to Mr. Murphy of the 16th of that month, whining to them of the "sympathies of the people of this country," by whom, at the time of the rejection of the

previous proposal, "the question was not understood." He threatened them harder; "The first measure of the new emigrants, as soon as they shall have sufficient strength, will be to destroy that great domestic institution upon which so much of the prosperity of our country depends. * * * * If Texas should not be attached to the United States, she cannot maintain that institution ten years, and probably not half that time. You will readily perceive that, with such causes as these at work, a long continuance of peace between that country and the United States is absolutely impossible. War is inevitable." [Yes, we freemen of the North should have to carry on a war, as we are now doing under other circumstances, to force slavery on a foreign country]. And he assured them,— with what degree of truth the event of that session shows,— "measures have been taken to ascertain the opinions and views of Senators upon the subject, and it is found that a clear constitutional majority of two-thirds are in favor of the measure."

Under such appliances, a treaty of annexation was effected, and was ready to be signed at the time of the disaster of the Princeton.

Mr. Calhoun succeeded to the Department of State after a short interval, and, in communicating to Mexico the purpose of Mr. Tyler and his cabinet, took the perfidious ground that "the step was forced on the government of the United States, in self-defence, in consequence of the policy adopted by Great Britain in reference to the abolition of slavery in Texas;"* while to the British Envoy he wrote,† that "it was made necessary in order to preserve domestic institutions placed under the guaranty of the respective Constitutions of the two countries interested, and deemed essential to their safety and prosperity." This is the Secretary, who, after the sufficient experience the country had had of him, had been confirmed in his place by a unanimous vote of the Senate.

President Tyler, in his impatience, had ordered troops to the frontier of Texas, and a naval force to its coast, eleven days before the treaty was submitted to the Senate. But that body was restiff, and rejected it, after weeks of vehement debate, on the 8th day of June. Patriotism, justice, and humanity drew one more easy breath.

* Letter of April 19th, 1844, to Benjamin E. Green, Chargé.
† Letter of April 27th.

NO. VII.

FORTIFIED WITH A QUARTER PART OF MEXICO.

The prohibition in the Federal Constitution of the making of any treaty without the consent of two-thirds of the Senate, was a wise, just, and necessary provision of that instrument, for the protection of minorities of the States, represented *as States* in that body. Without it the Constitution could never have been adopted. The States, still independent communities, would never have given up such a power over their foreign relations to a bare majority of the States, still less of the people, of the confederation.

At the close of the session of 1843–4, the scheme for the annexation of Texas by means of the treaty-making power had been signally defeated. Scarcely any one yet had dreamed that it would be ever revived in any other form. Scarcely had it entered the wildest imagination, that any attempt would be made to put Massachusetts and New York under the government of Texas, by a process allowing them less of a voice, and less security, than they enjoyed in the negotiation of an arrangement for some trumpery commercial privilege.

But Mr. Tyler, and Mr. Calhoun, and the usurpers they represented, were not to be so put off. In the interval before the next meeting of Congress, they had insisted to the Texans that the measure was still pending, as if the Senate had not solemnly put an end to it by their action of June 8th; they had kept them in heart by military assistance, without any authority of law; and in his message at the opening of Congress in December, 1844, the President announced that the question "has been submitted to the ordeal of public sentiment. A controlling majority of the people, and a large majority of the States, have declared in favor of immediate annexation. Instructions have thus come up to both branches of Congress, from their respective constituents, in terms the most emphatic. It is the will of both the people and the States that Texas shall be annexed to the Union promptly and immediately." And he adds, "The two governments having already *agreed* through their respective organs, on the terms of annexation, ['*I am the State*,' for the Senate, one of the powers necessary to any agreement by the Constitution, had *disagreed*], I would recommend their adoption by Congress, in the form of *a joint Resolution or Act*, to be perfected and made binding on the two countries, when adopted, in like manner, by the government of Texas."

The President's declaration of the will of the people respecting the annexation of Texas was his inference from the result of the

then recent Presidential election. The democratic convention, which, a week before the rejection of the treaty by the Senate, had nominated Mr. Polk, had at the same time adopted some dozen resolutions, expressing the sense of its members on as many matters of public policy. One of them was as follows: "that our title to the whole of Oregon is clear and unquestionable; that no portion of the same ought to be ceded to England or any other power, and that the re-occupation of Oregon and the re-annexation of Texas at the earliest practicable period, are great American measures, which this Convention recommend to the cordial support of the Democracy of the Union." Mr. Polk was chosen (having sixteen out of twenty-six States in his favor), and the question of annexation, said Mr. Tyler and his Secretary, was thereby decided at the polls. Bank, Tariff, Internal Improvements, Sub-Treasury, Native Americanism, Distribution of the Public Lands, Oregon, and other issues raised in the Resolutions of the nominating Convention, were to go for nothing, — for nothing, the electioneering frauds in Louisiana, Pennsylvania and New York, — for nothing, the sixteen thousand Liberty Party votes in the latter State, which, though they gave Mr. Polk the election, were hardly meant to be for annexation. Texas, and Texas only, had been in the people's mind; their votes had instructed Congress; and annex Texas it must, *bon gré, mal gré* that Constitution, which the President and Congress were sworn to support.

So annex they did, as far as in them lay, though with no more constitutional right or power to do it, than any other two hundred and eighty men in the country, who should get together some fine morning, and pass a similar vote for the annexation of China with the Celestial Emperor's consent. On the 26th of January, 1845, after three or four weeks' debate, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 120 to 98, resolved on its part, "that Congress doth consent that the Territory properly included within, and rightfully belonging to, the Republic of Texas, may be erected into a new State, to be called the State of Texas, with a republican form of government, to be adopted by the people of said Republic, by deputies in Convention assembled, with the consent of the existing government, in order that the same may be admitted as one of the States of this Union."

The Senate held out better, and for five weeks of sharp anxiety there was hope that it would not betray its great trust. At length it was known that the combined forces of intrigue and corruption, party management, General Jackson's thunder, and executive patronage, had secured about enough votes from the North to do the iniquitous work of the Slave Power, and that the issue hung only on the will of a Democratic Senator from the South, whose conscience, notwithstanding the biasses of his position and his party creed, refused as yet to be silenced. A wretched artifice obtained the vote of the recusant Senator, and without a day's delay a messenger was

sped to Texas to invite her to enter the breach that bad men had made through the constitutional defences of the people of the United States.

All the rest the usurpers affected to regard as only form, and proceeded to force through the formal measures with violent and indecent haste. Congress met, in 1845, on the first day of December. On the 10th, immediately on the appointment of the committees, the portion of the President's message relating to the admission of Texas was referred to the Committee on the Territories. The next day, that Committee reported to the House a Resolution, "that the State of Texas shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatever." It was made the Order of the Day for the fifth day after, at which time the *Previous Question* was immediately called for and sustained, the Constitution of the new State having been placed in the members' hands only the day before. In an hour and forty minutes the thing was over in the House, the insult to the Constitution being scarcely aggravated by a second Resolution, giving to Texas two Representatives till the census of 1850, without any thing to show that its population is as great as that of Delaware, which has but one.* Of all days in the three hundred and sixty-five, the final act passed the Senate on the 22d day of December, while at Plymouth they were celebrating the landing of the pioneers of freedom in this Western World. Wonderful was it, that the hundred and one glorious ghosts of 1620, on that ninth quarter-century of the ripening of the seed they sowed, did not "squeak and gibber" in the merry hall, to the drowning of speech and joke, of horn and cymbal.

NO. VIII.

OBJECTIONS TO ANNEXATION IN THE FREE STATES.— COUNTER-CURRENT IN MASSACHUSETTS.

"The measure of annexation is calculated and designed, by the open declarations of its friends, to uphold the interests of slavery, extend its influence, and secure its permanent duration."

This is quoted from Mr. Calhoun. The declaration, and some of its bearings, were early understood in some of the free States, and they took their measures accordingly. In 1838 some of the Legislatures expressed the sense of their constituents. That of Rhode Island passed Resolutions, denying the competency of any

* In the autumn of 1844, at the election of President in Texas, 12,752 votes were cast. The smallest number of votes, at the same time, in any Congressional District in Massachusetts, was 10,120, and those Districts send but one member. The next smallest number was 12,113.

branch of the government to effect the annexation, or that it could be accomplished "without the formation of a new compact of Union." The General Assembly of Ohio unanimously declared, "that Congress has no power conferred on it by the Constitution of the United States to consent to such annexation; and that the people of Ohio cannot be bound by any such covenant, league, or arrangement, made between Congress and any foreign state or nation." The General Court of Massachusetts resolved, also unanimously, "We do, in the name of the people of Massachusetts, earnestly and solemnly protest against the annexion of Texas to this Union, and declare that no act done, or compact made, for such purpose, by the government of the United States, will be binding on the States or the people."

When the villany was started again in 1843, and till its consummation, the protests of the same States were renewed, with continued unanimity, with frequent repetition, and, if possible, in still more emphatic language. No party within their borders could take the opposite ground without suicide. Connecticut and New Jersey added their wholesome testimony. New Hampshire and Maine were still in their slavish democratic bonds. Pennsylvania is brutish, and did nothing, but like the strong ass Issachar crouched down beneath her burdens, and bowed her shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute. New York did nothing. Poor soulless giant, her honorable history is yet to begin. From her colonial times, when, patching up a dastardly truce, she helped the French and Indians down from the Berkshire hills against the shield which brave Massachusetts held over the New England settlements, through the time of her traitors of the Revolutionary age, down to the time of her Butlers and her Marcys, her Van Burens and Hoyts, poltroonery and corruption have with her ruled the hour. Nature has her freaks, and in one of them she gave a great man, John Jay, to New York. Hamilton was a waif from the West Indies on her spirit-barren strand, and Rufus King from Massachusetts. No doubt, among her millions, she has many wise and good, but the day when they begin to impress any fit influence of theirs upon her counsels, will open a new chapter in the annals of New York.

Massachusetts was the back-bone of the opposition. Standing erect, and (as it seemed) unenfeebled by division, just and patriotic men every where were hoping that the contagion of her stern example would yet save the land from bitter shame. While the Joint Resolutions were pending, a great convention of her citizens met in Faneuil Hall, to utter her warning in yet another form. The call was signed by men of all parties,—the men accustomed to represent, on important occasions, the intelligence, the property, the patriotism, and weight of character of the Commonwealth,—though already was remarked an absence of a small number of names, to which subsequent developments gave a significance. A vigorous Address, worthy of the place of deliberation, and of the old times

it had kindred with, was sent forth to the people by a unanimous assent. Massachusetts seemed all nerve and heart. She gave another ringing response from her Legislative halls. It was more than four months after Mr. Polk's election, and four weeks after the passage of the Joint Resolution through Congress, that, by solemn Resolution, with only twenty-seven dissenting voices, in her legislature of more than three hundred members, she repeated her "refusal to acknowledge the Act of the government of the United States, authorizing the admission of Texas, as a legal act."

Through all its stages, the measure had been carried with a high hand. But it is bad generalship to rely on hard knocks alone. Mr. Walker, one of the Coryphæi of the scheme, undertook to coax some support for it among the ill-affected in the free States. In 1844, at the close of his widely-circulated letter of January 8th [all mischief now-a-days shelters itself under that date], after showing to the slave holders how annexation would increase their power, and raise the value of their property, and giving to various other interests their portion in due season, he turned to the friends of protection for domestic industry in the east, and told them with due emphasis of italics and capitals, "Let it be known, and proclaimed as a *certain truth*, and as a result which can *never hereafter be changed or recalled*, that, upon the refusal of re-annexation, now and in all time to come, THE TARIFF, AS A PRACTICAL MEASURE, FALLS WHOLLY AND FOR EVER, and we shall thereafter be compelled to resort to direct taxes to support the government." Be not incredulous, gentle reader. This is the self-same Mr. Robert J. Walker, now Secretary of the Treasury, whose bill for the repeal of the Tariff passed the House of Representatives on the third day of July instant, and in the week of this present writing will be carried through the Senate by those two Texan votes, which he was so eloquent with the cotton manufacturers to give him, in order that the Tariff might be saved. How strange that the wise should ever be caught in their own craftiness!

What effect this friendly suggestion had in winning over opposition, is not to be known. Motives are by no means always evident, even to the party moved. Certain it is, however, that Mr. Walker did not reckon altogether without his host, when he considered that there are those in the Whig party, with whom the Tariff is the cardinal point of the party creed; and, if any expected to buy the forbearance of the South by surrendering every high principle of public action, and writing themselves recreant to what had made them objects of confidence as public men, and if, after all, they found themselves deceived, it was no fault of Mr. Walker's that they miscalculated and were disappointed after all the experience of the past. And certain it is, at all events, that, in the summer and autumn of 1845, an unexpected state of sentiment was manifested, even in some high quarters in Massachusetts. The people of the Commonwealth felt more injured and more determined. The leaders in a part of it winced.

For the first time, in the following winter, there was defection in a portion of the Whig party in the General Court. Mr. Wilson, the steadfast and true-hearted member from Natick in the House, introduced a Resolve covering more ground than that of any previous legislative action, and frankly expressive of the sense of the towns of Massachusetts, respecting the sterner attitude which the abuses of the times required. It passed the House in the following words, "That Massachusetts distinctly and solemnly announces to the country her uncompromising opposition to the further extension of American slavery; that she hereby deliberately declares her earnest and unalterable purpose to use every lawful and Constitutional measure for its overthrow and entire extinction; and she hereby pledges her cordial co-operation to the friends of civil liberty throughout the Union, in every just and practical measure that shall tend to free our country from the dominion, curse and shame of slavery, and make her great and glorious among the nations."

The vote for the Resolve was 147 to 52. There was about the latter number of Democrats in the House.

In the Senate, the addition made by Mr. President Calhoun to the Joint Committee to whom the Resolve was referred, gave it into hands which might have been expected to strangle it. Their report, not meeting the issue, but representing that the resistance of Massachusetts had already been sufficiently protracted, was adverse to the Resolve. The report was accepted, in the Senate, by a vote of 20 to 16. Of the Suffolk Senators, only two stood for the Resolve. So far as may be gathered from that indication, there would be some plausibility in the assertion that the Resolve does not express the sense of Boston. But it does stand, and will stand, nevertheless, as the sense of Massachusetts. William Pinckney said, nearly sixty years ago, that if slavery should survive fifty years, it would work a "decay of the spirit of liberty in the Free States." But he prophesied too gloomily. The capitals may cower; but the interior will be true. Massachusetts, at least, has done, and will do, her part to discredit the prediction.

NO. IX.

CONSEQUENCES OF *COTTONING* TO IT IN THE NORTH.

A RECENT number of the New Orleans "Tropic" contains the following remark;—

"After Congress had been in session some time, Mr. Polk ordered the army to march to the Rio Grande. * * * * * Now there must be some good reason for this extraordinary movement on his part, that should be known to the people. It must not be forgotten that *Mr. Polk claimed the Nueces as the boundary line between Mexico and Texas when he came into power*, and on the banks of that river

the army of occupation was stayed a long time. Now it is important to the people of the United States for Mr. Polk to give his reasons for changing his mind."

Certainly the advance of the troops from the Nueces to the Rio Grande was rather a bold step on Mr. Polk's part. Helping himself to Texas with any boundaries was bad enough. But the country between those rivers had nothing to do with Texas. It no more belonged to that province than did the capital city of Mexico. It lies within the boundaries (passing from North to South) of New Mexico, Chihuahua, Coahuila, and Tamaulipas. So every delineation, except the fraudulent Congressional map, represents it. So Mr. Polk's own party friends understood it, till enlightened by the success of their own effrontery, and the truckling of their opponents. The proposal of General Jackson's government, said Mr. Benton,* "extended to no part of the river, or even of the valley, of the Rio del Norte. Not a drop of the water of that river, — not an inch of the soil of its valley, — did he propose to disrupt from its old possessor, and to incorporate into our Union. * * * * * They meditated no such *crime or folly* as that of adding the left bank of the Rio del Norte, from head to mouth, to our Union." "The treaty," he said again, "in all that relates to the boundary of the Rio Grande, is an act of unparalleled outrage on Mexico."

We *guess* we may be able to throw some light on the subject of the "Tropic's" curiosity. Down to late in the autumn of 1845, the feeling of the masses of the Free States seemed to be growing constantly more intense in respect to the tremendous outrage of the Slave Power, that was in progress. Down to this time, Massachusetts had appeared entirely in earnest, and the greater part of her New England sisters had ranged themselves by her side. Even slave-ridden New Hampshire was picking herself up from the mud, and scraping herself clean from the filth of her ancient alliance; while Ohio, the hero of the West, was going on, as she will yet go on, in a way worthy of her clear head and brave heart. Bold and arrogant as the usurpers were, it was still prudent to keep some measures.

While things stood thus, there came surprising news from Boston to Washington, understood to betoken that "the head" of opposition "was sick, and the heart faint." Mr. Appleton, and some of his friends at the centre of New England influence, had given in their adhesion, or at least withdrawn their opposition, and discouraged that of their associates. Mr. Polk has a man in his cabinet from New England, skilled to erect broad conclusions on a narrow basis of facts, and he had now some materials for the argument that Massachusetts, weakened by this defection in her old strong hold, was going to show the white feather. The news of the new movement reached Washington on the first day of the meeting of Congress. Nothing material was done, of a nature to bring that inference into question, by any delegate from the North in either House.

* Speech in Secret Session, May 20th, 1844.

The game of opposition, hoped the slave usurpers, is up. If the free States are so content with what has already come and gone, and so easy about what is threatened to come next, they may be reckoned on to put up with any thing that can come. A little more or a little less, will not fret them. Accordingly, as soon as the matter could be properly thought over, viz: on the 13th day of January, orders were issued to General Taylor to push on to the Rio Grande, where he established his batteries on the left bank, commanding the Mexican town on the other side. And so opened our Polka war-dance, to the tune of half a million of dollars a day. It exists, so the Congressmen voted, "by the act of Mexico." Certainly. Of course. History will make no question of that, nor of the scrupulosity of the voters.

The demonstration of Mr. Appleton and his friends, whenever and however else it might have been made, was simultaneous with, and was apparently occasioned by, a vigorous movement of the people, which, without doubt, it did much to embarrass and check, coming, as it did, as unexpectedly as a thunder-clap in a clear sky. In November, 1845, before the Texan Constitution had been presented for the examination of Congress, and while, of course, by the very provisions of the Act of the previous session, the question was still pending, the Massachusetts State Texas Committee undertook to procure an expression of the freemen of the country, with a view to arrest the measure. They applied for aid to Mr. Appleton among others whose previous course had appeared to mark them as friendly to the object. In a letter, in which he declined to give it, he said, "For all practical purposes, as far as the people are concerned, I consider the question as settled. * * * * * Massachusetts has done her duty, and her Senators and Representatives will continue to do theirs. Beyond that, I cannot think it good policy to waste our efforts upon the impossible."

How was the "question settled?" Why was the defeat of the measure "impossible," if its honest enemies had even then resolutely combined? In the erection of Missouri into a State, the battle had been bravely fought to the bat's end, and it was only then by a majority of six in the House, that the cause of slavery triumphed. The Texas measure fell to the ground, after all that had taken place, if, in the House of Representatives then about to meet, a majority could have been found against it. In that House, there were to be only 88 members from the Slave States, against 135 from the Free, so that unless 24 members from the Free States should prove faithless to the cause of freedom, Texas would not be annexed, *with a Constitution recognising slavery*, which was all the petitioners at this time objected to. Was there no hope of preventing that number from going over, by a strenuous remonstrance on the part of their free constituents? Are there no timid party-men, who, drilled and welded to the wrong as they may be, would yet like to be emboldened to the right by voices from their homes? Are there

no party-men, who, however devoted to the wrong, have a wholesome fear of those on whose votes they must rely for the next election? Late as was the effort, and grievous and noxious as was the opposition which it encountered in the house of its friends, no fewer than some sixty thousand remonstrants sent up their names from Massachusetts, and probably not far from forty thousand more from other States. If the proportion of remonstrants to voters had been the same in the other free States as in this, the aggregate number of the former would have been no less than 880,000. Would that number, or even the half of it, have produced no effect? And what tended more to prevent it than the bolting at the centre of operations?

The question was "settled." Have Mr. Appleton and his friends always reasoned thus? It was no more expressly doomed by the Baltimore Resolutions, nor determined by the issue of the Presidential election, than was the repeal of the Tariff Bill. Yet did Mr. Appleton and his friends acquiesce in that settlement? Or did they desist from their resistance till the bill was repealed this week?

The question was "settled." Did the very signs of the times, to an observant eye, hold out not the remotest hope of unsettling it? Was there no bargain pending about Oregon and Texas, the breach of which has since shivered the democratic party? And was there no probability whatever that the rogues might fall out in that quarrel, in time for honest men to have another chance for their rights, if they would only continue to look after them?

The question was "settled." What if it had been? Did Massachusetts owe nothing then to her principles, her pledges, her character? Did she owe no record of honorable action to future history? Have Mr. Appleton and his friends always reasoned thus? The question of the Presidential election we in Massachusetts knew to be "settled" on Thursday night, the 7th of November, 1844. Yet on Monday the 11th, under the cheer of these same leaders, we went to the polls, and rolled up a plurality of fourteen thousand for the defeated candidate. Our notion then was, and the truth was and forever is, that the more adverse the times, the more honorable is stedfastness to principle and profession.

But Mr. Appleton and his friends in Boston said that the question was settled, and the House of Representatives, at Washington, took them at their word. Without such encouragement to believe that the spirit of Liberty was "settled" in the Free States, they would scarcely have ventured to force the measure through the last stage, with such insulting and outrageous haste as characterised the proceedings of the 16th day of December.

NO. X.

WHAT HAS THE NORTH TO DO WITH IT?—THE NORTH IS A FRACTION OF THE HUMAN RACE.

"I AM a man," said the classical poet, "and to nothing which concerns men am I indifferent." He was a slave, though one of the great writers of Rome. But he put the sentiment into the mouth of a freeman; and every where, and in all ages, the free heart of man has an echo for it.

"I am an American," may we add, "and there is nothing which concerns the character and honor of my country, that does not interest me."

Massachusetts has concerned herself to good purpose about all the great troubles that afflict mankind. She began the Temperance reformation, and has sent its beneficent influence to the borders of the civilized world. She instituted Peace Societies, and has leavened the whole mass of Christian thought and sentiment on that momentous subject. She established the first American mission to the heathen; and of the missionaries who have gone from this continent, one quarter part have been her sons and daughters, while the proportion of money contributed by her for the same purpose, as compared with that from the whole country, has not been less.

Domestic slavery includes all forms of cruelty and wrong. Never, nowhere, in the most barbarous countries and ages, has it existed in a more horrid form than in these United States. Men scourged and branded, — women scourged, branded, and prostituted, — the sweet charities of domestic life denied, — husbands parted from wives, children from parents, under the hammer and the whip, — human reduced to mere brute life, and made as much more wretched as fear, despair, and outraged human feelings can make it, — these and all the untold distresses that belong to them, are the matters with which the North, made up of men and women with human hearts, has no concern whatever. The North had some concern, as usual, twenty-five years ago, when Grecian slavery sent its arousing appeal across the ocean. But we have no details of Turkish savageness, to show that it would stand any comparison with ours.

Our friends who go on visits from the North, are subject to some error on this subject. Their introductions bring them acquainted with the most cultivated part of the Southern community. Whatever may present itself to give them pain, they see its slavery only in its least revolting shape. On the large and carefully ordered plantation of a proprietor of wealth and refinement, its hardships are mitigated, besides being kept out of view, though much of its hardship will there depend on the temper of the master, and more on that of his underlings. But it is only a very small part of the ag-

gregate of slaves, that comes even thus far under the observation of strangers. Supposing ten to be the average number held by each proprietor, which cannot be far from a correct estimate, it follows, — and such is the fact, — that, while a considerable portion are attached to large estates, another considerable portion, by one, two, and three, and so on, in a family, are in the power of persons of inferior condition, little better instructed or less brutal than themselves, and not like the independent laborer in moderate circumstances at the North, frugal, industrious, orderly, self-respecting and self-controlled, but persons living in such idleness and gross indulgences as the forced labor at their command may admit, and without mental training or delicacy to restrain the capricious abuse of their despotic authority.

It is impossible to reflect too sorrowfully on the condition of man, woman or child, in the keeping of rude ruffians like these. But cultivation of mind, and refinement of manners, are no pledge even for that moderation of character, which, after all, in its fullest exercise, could only abate a small part of the essential evils of the institution. Lord Byron said that Ali Pasha was the mildest mannered person he ever saw. The condition of slavery subjects one man to the unrestricted power of another, for every thing short of life and death; and this is a power which cannot fail to be enormously abused, on the whole, as long as man is man.

It is mere impertinence to say that slaves will be well treated, because such treatment is for the master's interest. What man, especially what man whose will is law, takes counsel uniformly of his interest? Masters are not made up of mere prudence and consideration. They are liable, like other people, to be also whimsical, passionate, and violent, and their arbitrary power inflames these humors. Providence, in committing children so fully to the care of parents, has protected them through the parental affection, one of the deepest instincts of our nature, which, however, is often seen to be a scarcely adequate security against unkindness and wrong. Where is the protection against the irritated master, or against his brutal overseer, for the indolent, wasteful, stupid, and provoking slave; indolent and wasteful, because without any better excitement than fear; stupid, because forbidden to learn? Nor is it by any means the settled maxim at the South that it has been often supposed to be, that a kind treatment of slaves is for the master's interest. The story is commonly told in Louisiana of one who, not long ago, was perhaps the largest proprietor in the State, that he expressly maintained the opposite doctrine, that it was cheaper to buy than to keep or rear, and that he worked his slaves accordingly, renewing his supply by purchase every few years.

Any particular array of facts is superfluous, at the same time that it must be altogether imperfect, while the unavoidable tendencies of such a state of things stare us so fully in the face. But one can hardly keep getting enough of them for his satisfaction, if he has

occasion to pass through our Southern country. Let him travel in the public conveyances, in Georgia and Alabama, and day by day (we speak from knowledge) he shall be forced to see the most wicked outrages inflicted on those defenceless people. Let him take the stage coaches through Virginia, he shall hear, hour after hour, stories told by the neighbors of the parties, showing the deplorable degradation of morals created by this baleful institution.

They say that whipping, branding, and other tortures, manacling and collaring with iron, hunting runaways with dogs, the separation of families by sale, the prohibition of that knowledge which makes a man different from a beast, are necessary to the existence of forced servitude. That is what we say too. And further we say, that because such wrongs are necessary to it, the institution is too bad to exist.*

We of New England are not alone in saying so. The whole world, civilized and savage, is coming to a remarkable unanimity upon the subject. Not only England has abolished it. The half-civilized Mexican, the barbarous African, the Bey of Tunis, have abolished it, as too cruel a thing to be longer allowed by any who have drank the milk of woman. The King of Dahomey, the last accounts from Guinea say, is taking steps for its abolition. The King of Dahomey is putting Mr. Calhoun and Governor Hammond to shame.

A profound sentiment of disgust and indignation pervades the civilized world. There are circles abroad, — not circles of rank, but of intelligence, refinement, and worth, — into which a man can have no admission, when it is once known that he is an American, till it is further known that he is not a slaveholder. Soon an Amer-

* Mr. Walker, in his "Letter relative to the Annexation of Texas," by way of showing the superior advantages of slavery, and the inhumanity of a free condition for the blacks, stated (p. 12) that of blacks in the non-slaveholding States, one in 96 was either deaf and dumb, blind, an idiot, or insane! For the basis of this precious argument, he referred to "the official returns of the census of 1840," made probably by some poor creatures who were paid their electioneering wages by being employed in this business. How fit they were for it, at any rate, or how well they understood what would please their employers, may be inferred from the following specimens of their report, among a vast number of others not at all less remarkable:

Colored Inhabitants in Towns of Massachusetts.

	Total.	*Insane.*		*Total.*	*Insane.*
Freetown	0	2	Sterling	0	2
Plympton	2	4	Danvers	0	2
Leominster	0	2	Georgetown	1	2
Wilmington	0	2	Worcester	151	133

While in Maine, by the same ciphering, it turned out that every fourteenth negro was afflicted with mental aberration.

What was worse, Mr. Secretary Calhoun must needs make the same use of these stupid falsehoods, and publish them, and his arguments founded on them, to the laughing world, in his letter to Mr. Pakenham of April 18th, 1844; and when the House of Representatives, on Mr. Adams's motion, called his attention to the subject, he replied that he was "not aware of any errors in the census."

ican slave-holding envoy will find his position uncomfortable in Europe. The Church of Scotland will SEND BACK THE MONEY, contributed by American slaveholders to its necessities. The great ecclesiastical bodies among us can keep up no cohesion, with this dividing element; one after another, within the last two years, they have been sundering, by force of the moral antagonism within their vitals. The political organizations feel it. Mr. Berrien of Georgia is said to be a gentleman of estimable qualities; but who does not know that his participation in our electioneering canvass of 1844 was strongly distasteful to many of our patriotic yeomen, and that where his Whig argument persuaded one voter, his slavery presence sometimes disturbed and discouraged two? And this before any body could have foreboded that he would have been one of the majority of the Committee, which carried the final measure for the annexation of Texas through the Senate.

What has the North to do with Slavery? Just as much as humanity has, and that is a great deal; just as much as the decent reputation of the country has; and just as much as the South itself has, in respect to part of the jurisdiction of these United States. The Territories, which we of the North, as much as any body, have the responsibility of governing, have borne the stain as broadly and as deeply as any portion of the land. The District of Columbia, for which we are legislators, is the great slave-market of the Union; and Northern Members of Congress, present there on the public service, must day by day be witnesses to enormities, which they, or at all events their constituents, execrate from the bottom of their hearts. Have they nothing to do with that? Will mankind, will just history, will Christianity, will a righteous God, admit any such plea?

NO. XI.

WHAT HAS THE NORTH TO DO WITH IT?—BUSINESS OF THE NORTH SACRIFICED.

THE mail of Wednesday week put us in the way of one answer to this question. It is not worth while to do any thing to prevent the annexation of Texas, said some of our politicians, towards the close of 1845. About the middle of 1846, two Texan votes in the United States Senate strip thousands of freemen in the North of their means of an honest livelihood. Foisted in among us by the Southern usurpers, a petty foreign province, without the slightest Constitutional right to interfere in our affairs, has struck a staggering blow at the industry of the workshops of Massachusetts.

The Slave Power will not endure that Northern freemen should prosper. Slave labor and free labor it regards as antagonistic interests. Down to 1816, the South waged war on commerce, then our only way to wealth. To raise the price of their cotton, they determined that we should manufacture or starve. We did not incline to starve, and we learned to manufacture. The sight of our new prosperity annoys them as much as the sight of the old. They will not understand that it is because we *work*, with the spirit and intelligence of freemen (which they will not do), that we flourish, and they are out at the elbows.

> "Base envy withers at another's joy
> And hates that excellence it cannot reach."

So after many a struggle, defeated by what survived of the good sense and patriotic feeling of the country, they have succeeded at length, with the aid of their new allies, in striking down a system coeval with the existence of the government, but more essential now, as they persuade themselves, to our well-being than to their own. The Slave-Power has done it. Who does not know that? Has the wronged and cheated North nothing to do with the Slave Power?

By the disposition it has manifested to truckle to that power in order to secure its indulgence and patronage, the North has been rather too apt to show its consciousness of having something to do with it, as an element of our politics. If it is ever to learn better, it might seem that it now has its lesson. Acquiescence in the unutterable atrocity of the annexation of Texas, did not save the Tariff. Texas has stricken the Tariff down. The retributive justice that never spares public delinquency, has executed speedily its judgment against an evil work.

Mr. Davis is reported to have said, the other day, in the Senate, that the Tariff system "had occupied the attention of the people of this country for more than twenty years. * * * It had in fact been *the* great political question of all that period." It is *a* great question, without doubt, particularly in its moral aspects. A man reasonably expects of the government which he supports, that it shall allow him a fair chance to obtain by his industry the means of a decent living, and of an education for his children; and, to be prosperous in a higher sense than has any thing to do with pampering or finery, a community needs to have a competent provision for its members. But Scripture is wiser than trade, when it declares that a man's *life* consisteth not in the abudance of the things which he possesseth. He may buy that abundance so dear, that it shall visit him with the most wretched of all poverty. To some people it may seem preaching to say so; but there is, after all, a greater question than that of the Tariff, which the free people of this country have in hand, and which the Whig party, that professes to wish them well, ought to have vigorously in hand; and

that is, the question of LIBERTY and RIGHT. The Tariff Bill of 1842 had its merits; but, strange though it may sound in some ears, the Preamble to the American Constitution contains far more important meaning in less space.

Mr. Appleton did not think it worth while last autumn to make an effort for freedom against Texas. He said the question of annexation was "settled," and the administration concluded, on his showing, that the spirit of liberty was disposed of too in the Free States. It is true he thought the Tariff question was also settled. In his communication to the "National Intelligencer," reprinted here last winter in a pamphlet, he said, "This is the cry which is expected to break down the tariff, and *there is little doubt it will succeed;* for the party have set up the cry, and *they have decided majorities in both branches of Congress.*" (p. 21). But, hopeless as opposition was in Mr. Appleton's opinion, still, in the momentous matter of the tariff, he thought it expedient to persevere to the end, for he is wise man enough to know that exertion is always manly and prudent, even when the chances of success are small. Why this difference in the two cases? Was it that in the one case the desire to succeed was great, and in the other it was little or none?

According to the interpretation of Mr. Appleton and some of his friends, not only does the *Whig creed* seem to be synonymous with the late *Tariff system*, but the Tariff seems to mean nothing but protection for the cotton manufacture. Now, in Massachusetts, Tariff ought to mean something besides cotton. Of the manufactured products of that State, cotton (calico included) does not equal one-sixth part. It is not even the principal article. Leather (including boots and shoes) exceeds it by nearly two millions of dollars. And if the cotton manufacture, conducted by rich corporations, has given the principal occasion to that clamor of demagogues against capitalists, by which the other forms of manufacture, neither conducted by corporations nor owned by capitalists, have been made to suffer, it is doubly hard if any hazardous experiment to purchase an exclusive security or advantage for the former, should be found to result in a sacrifice not only of itself, but of all the rest.

Manufacturers of Massachusetts, look at Mr. Appleton's pamphlet, entitled "What is a Revenue Standard?" circulated here last spring, and see how many interests of yours were thought worthy of consideration, in a discussion of the Tariff. With the exception of a paragraph on woolens, and a line or two on straw hats, and a few more on silk (a very unimportant article), all the rest of the argument, as far as Massachusetts is concerned, relates to cotton. What do the 48,000 shoemakers and tanners of Massachusetts say to this?

"Ho! workers of the old time styled
'The gentle craft of Leather,'"

are the eighteen millions which you produce out of the hundred millions of annual manufacturing product of the Commonwealth, of no account in connexion with protection for native industry? Papermakers, hatters, glass-blowers, men of all the other crafts, which in the aggregate exceed six fold the production of cotton, is the Tariff nothing to you? If slavery had not been established in Texas by its admission to this Union, you would have had a large market for your wares among the freemen who would then soon have occupied that inviting country.* Above all, if Texas had not been admitted, the Tariff which protected your domestic market would not have been repealed, as it was. With the admission of Texas, and its consequent perpetual slavery, the cotton manufacturers may get their raw material a fraction of a cent lower on the pound, and they may find a sale for a few more cheap negro cloths. But how much of your paper will the slaves use in writing to their friends? How many cases of your hats will they order in a year? How much of your glass will the luxury of their tables and their drawing-rooms require? How many of your spermaceti candles will they need to light their halls, how much of your cabinet ware to furnish their chambers? If the admission of Texas was expected to benefit the cotton trade, how much gratitude do you owe to the disinterestedness of those who have been willing to have your business broken up by Texan votes? If a willingness to admit Texas was expected to be a means of conciliating the Southern despots, so that they would consent to let the Tariff stand, how much respect do you owe to the sagacity of such calculators?

A man in Mr. Appleton's position is not favorably circumstanced in respect to comprehensive and elevated views of public policy. He may be skilled in finance, — in questions of currency, exchange and customs,— but his habits of thought at best lead him to concern himself with the obvious and superficial causes of material prosperity, to the neglect or obstruction of those which are more efficient and vital. He pries knowingly among the wheels and spindles, but does not care so much for the source of the stream that sets them going. There is a thousand fold more wise, and manly, and profitable statesmanship in George Putnam's Election Sermon, wherein he showed how righteousness exalteth a nation, and how Massachusetts had been prosperous because she had been religious and brave, than in all that Mr. Appleton ever said or wrote put together. "Whenever," said that sensible preacher, "she shall come down from her high Christian estate, and disown her baptismal vows, then, — look at her history, look at her position, and acknowledge it, — then her prosperity will become disease, her

* "The first measure of the new emigrants, as soon as they shall have sufficient strength, will be to *abolish that great domestic institution*, upon which so much of the prosperity of our Southern country depends. * * * * * If Texas should not be attached to the United States, she cannot maintain that institution ten years, and probably not half that time." *Mr. Upshur to Mr. Murphy*, January 16th, 1844.

trumpet voice of truth and right will be hushed, her horn of power will be broken, and *all her glory* departed." Her Appletons, — yes, and her Websters, — will be safer and stronger guardians of her interests, in proportion as they take diligent note of this, and govern themselves accordingly. To forget it, while it is to transgress far weightier maxims, is to violate that which is of the gravest import of all, on 'change; it is to be "penny wise and pound foolish."

NO. XII.

WHAT HAS THE NORTH TO DO WITH IT?—ITS INFLUENCE ON THE COMPETENCY OF VOTERS AND RULERS.

The Fifth Chapter of the Constitution of Massachusetts, in its second section, declares as follows:

"Wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue, diffused generally among the body of the people, being *necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties*, and as these depend on spreading the opportunities and advantages of education in the various parts of the country, and among the different orders of the people, it shall be the duty of legislatures and magistrates, in all future periods of this Commonwealth, to cherish the interests of literature and the sciences, * * * * to countenance and inculcate the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity, industry and frugality, honesty and punctuality in their dealings, sincerity, good humor, and all social affections, and generous sentiments among the people."

Massachusetts established her Constitution in 1780, when she was, to all intents and purposes, a sovereign State. While her people were thus under her own government alone, she was of opinion that they could have no security for their *rights and liberties*, any longer than they should be intelligent and virtuous. What was true for her then, is true for her now. What was true for her, was, and is, equally true for her sister States. None of them can have any security for their rights and liberties under the rule of an ignorant and vicious population.

Yet such a rule the slave power unavoidably creates; and, the slave power having obtained the ascendancy in our government, under such a rule do we at present live. Does that not concern the North? Has it no concern with the character and competency of those who govern it? If the slave power had not obtained the usurped ascendancy which it now wields, still, has the North no concern about the character and competency of those who, by the Constitution, share with it the functions of government, and are to pass on questions the most material to its welfare?

Of the thirteen original States, the population of the four most

northerly, in 1840, was 1,441,081, and the number of white persons in them, over twenty years of age, who could neither read nor write, was 7,530, or less than one in 191. The free population of the four southern old States, was 1,976,220, and the number of free white persons, over twenty years of age, who could neither read nor write, was 166,728, or one in less than 12. Massachusetts had 4,448 of this ignorant class, most of them in the few towns where foreign emigrants collect. Virginia, with a total of free inhabitants only fifty-three thousand larger, had 58,787. In New Hampshire, the proportion of persons unable to read and write to the whole free population, was as one to more than 300, in South Carolina and Georgia about as one to 13. In Connecticut, one in 590 could neither read nor write; in North Carolina, more than one in 9. These are the facts, supposing the census to have been correctly taken in these particulars. But considering the auspices under which it was made, and the class of errors which vitiate it, of which we gave some rather striking specimens the other day, it is to be presumed that the representation, alarming as it is, is altogether more favorable to the slave States than the truth would warrant.

The case could not be otherwise. In slave States there can be no system of universal public instruction for the free. It is not the interest of the large proprietors to elevate the character of their poor neighbors, for the consequence would be an abatement of their own importance and political power. But waiving that, the division of estates is such as to put the arrangement out of the question. In New England, the people in moderate circumstances are every where, covering the face of the country, so that a school-house is brought within a convenient distance of every man's hearth; while in Virginia, if a poor man could get schooling for his child on the other side of the next plantation, it would take him the whole day to go and come. The thing is impossible.

We have not the statistics necessary to show the relative provision made for religious instruction in the Free and Slave States respectively. They would no doubt give a similar result. In New England, the traveller is never out of sight of the spires of churches, betokening that every New England family is brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. In Virginia, still older than New England, and in the Carolinas, not much less ancient, out of the cities one travels dismal miles without once seeing that cheering token of civilised humanity; and when, every now and then, it is met with, its wretched, tumble-down condition indicates scarcely less painfully the degree of importance attached to the use to which it is devoted. Of a fine day the women and children may make a journey from some "Swallow Barn" to some distant church in the woods, to say their prayers and get a word of exhortation from some transient preacher; but neighborhoods, where the institutions of the Gospel may be regularly supported, and where from Sabbath to Sabbath men may meet to recognise their mutual relation under the

roof of the common Parent, and learn the lessons which may make them mutually helpful during the week, such neighborhoods, in a region cut up into large properties for slave cultivation, must needs be few and far between.

We are not going to write a chapter on the morality of the free people of slave countries. But what is to be expected of a population, of which a considerable part is brought up without acquaintance with the very elements of knowledge, and a much larger, with extremely limited opportunities for religious instruction; among whom the rich, living on the compelled labor of others, are accustomed to the exercise of force, and, having no regular occupation to task and balance their minds, are the more accessible to every noxious excitement; and the poor, unfurnished with mental resources, and seeing labor accounted dishonorable, are robbed of that self-respect which is the guardian of all the virtues, and confined for their enjoyments to the gross range of physical indulgence? What is to be expected of the slave-master in his other relations, when, according to the slave-holder, Mr. Jefferson, "the whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the boisterous passions; * * * the child looks on; catches the lineaments of wrath; gives loose to the worst of passions; and, thus nursed and educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities?" What is to be expected, but what we read of, duels, assassinations, street broils, Lynch law, and so on? Such proceedings as burning negroes would perhaps hardly be expected, even in this state of things; but here reasonable expectation is surpassed, and they do occur.

We of the North know nothing of these doings except so much as the newspapers on the spot see fit to tell us, but these convey interesting information enough concerning the culture and moderation of the fellow-citizens under whose sway we live. We have before us a small collection of anecdotes of brutality from such papers, embracing a period of three years. Their details would make a book, which we have no thought of doing. Sometimes they generalize the facts. "Why," says a Mobile paper, "do we hear of stabbings and shootings *almost daily* in some part or other of our State?" "Almost every exchange paper that reaches us," says a Mississippi journal, "contains some inhuman and revolting case of murder, or death by violence." The New Orleans Bee thinks that "if crime increases as it has, it will soon become *the most powerful agent in destroying life;*" and Judge Canonge, of the same city, said from the bench, "without some powerful and certain remedy, our streets will become butcheries overflowing with the blood of our citizens." It is this state of society from which legislators come, and bring their accomplishments and habits with them. So the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Arkansas, not very long ago, settled a question of order by stabbing a member mortally with a bowie knife, on the floor of the House. So Mr. Campbell

and Mr. Maury of Tennessee, and in the same month Mr. Bell and Mr. Turney of the same State, fought at fisti-cuffs at Washington in the Hall where they sat as Representatives. So Mr. Peyton of Tennessee, and Mr. Wise of Virginia, went armed with pistols and dirks into a Committee-room of Congress, and threatened to kill a witness while giving his evidence. So Mr. Senator McDuffie of South Carolina, and Colonel Cumming of Georgia, worried and scandalized the decent part of the nation, season after season, with a publication of their successive plans for putting an end to each other; — a thing which, after all, they contrived not to effect.

Such would not be the Representatives of an enlightened and self-respecting constituency. *What has the North to do with slavery?* As much it has to do with good government; as much as it has to do with the difference between being governed by enlightened and orderly, or by ignorant, lawless and vicious fellow-citizens.

NO. XIII.

WHAT HAS THE NORTH TO DO WITH IT? — COSTLY AND WICKED WARS.

The North has something to do with the National Legislation, which has charge of all the great affairs of the national body, and presents it before the world and before history as a ruffian or a Christian people, according as a ruffian or Christian policy guides its counsels.

Outrages of the slave-holding administrations follow each other so fast, that the latest soon throws those which have preceded into forgetfulness.

It is but fifteen years, since the moral sense of the country and of the world was shocked by the barbarous treatment of the Cherokee Indians. By successive cessions of territory, they had become reduced to a tract of five millions of acres between the States of Georgia and Alabama. Sixteen successive treaties had been made with them by the United States, recognizing their competency to treat as independent communities, and guarantying to them the soil which they had determined to retain. Under the instructions of Christian missionaries, they had abandoned the practices of savage life, betaken themselves to the stationary pursuits of grazing and agriculture, and settled into an orderly and well-conducted community. They had schools, churches, books, and a printing-press and newspaper.

But the people of Georgia, one in every dozen of whom could not so much as read the plainest *English* the Cherokees could write, coveted their neighbors' houses and lands; and in 1827, an Act

of the Legislature of that State asserted the right of taking a forcible possession. The next year Georgia *extended her jurisdiction* (as she called it) over the territory, annexing it by parts to certain of her counties, and at the same time enacting that no Cherokee should be a party or a witness in any of her courts. The following year she enacted further, that if any Cherokee Chief should attempt to prevent the people of his tribe from emigrating, he should be liable to imprisonment for four years, and that if any Cherokee should attempt to prevent a Chief from selling the whole country, he should be imprisoned not less than four nor more than six years.

What was the government of the United States doing all this while, — that government, which, for valuable considerations, and by more solemn treaties than there are months in the year, had stipulated to protect them against all the world? It was doing the cowardly injustice, which the slave power dictated; little Georgia stormed,* and her natural allies stood by her, for the Cherokee country was charged with having given refuge to runaways. In 1830, the Indians appealed to General Jackson for defence against what they justly characterised as "a wanton usurpation of power, sanctioned neither by the common law of the land, nor by the laws of nature;" and were answered,† that they were to expect nothing from him, but must either submit to Georgia, or to a removal to lands beyond the Mississippi; and, suiting the action to the word, the President presently removed the troops which had been stationed for their defence. By an application for a writ of injunction against Georgia, they brought their case into the Supreme Court of the United States, where it went off on a technical objection. An overwhelming force was poured into their country. There was nothing further for them; and they were removed from their homes to a distant region beyond the Mississippi, there to remain, under just such another *guaranty* as those of which they had already experienced the value, till Arkansas shall be populous enough to be disposed to extend her jurisdiction over them as Georgia had done before. Under the direction of General Scott the removal was as humanely conducted as the cruel circumstances of the case allowed. Their lands were distributed by lottery among the people of Georgia, and the ineffaceable stain remains on the honor of the nation. Its character stands settled by a decree of the highest national tribunal. In September, 1831, three missionaries were sentenced by a Geor-

* During Mr. Adams's administration, when treaties were considered to have some binding force, Governor Troup, of Georgia, wrote as follows (Feb. 17th, 1827,) to the Secretary of War, in reply to an intimation that the Indians would be protected: "You will distinctly understand, that I feel it to be my duty to resist to the utmost any military attack which the Government of the United States shall think proper to make on the territory, the people, or the sovereignty of Georgia; and all measures necessary to the performance of this duty, according to our limited means, are in progress. From the first decisive act of hostility, you will be considered and treated as a public enemy."

† Letter of Mr. Eaton, Secretary of War, April 18th, 1829.

gia Court to four years' imprisonment in the penitentiary for residing among the Cherokees, without taking the oath of allegiance to that State. The case was carried up to the Supreme Court of the United States, who decreed (May 3d, 1832,) that the imprisonment was illegal, because the law of Georgia, assuming jurisdiction over the Cherokee country, was contrary to laws and treaties of the United States, and therefore null and void. The missionaries were discharged ten months after, but the poor Indians were without redress.

The Seminole troubles, of twenty-five years' duration from first to last, are fresher in the minds of this generation; a bill of twenty millions of dollars (and how much more nobody knows) has helped to keep their memory green. At the close of the war of 1812, a number of runaway slaves, from Georgia and elsewhere, collected in Florida, then a Spanish possession, fifteen or twenty miles above the mouth of the Apalachicola river, where they fenced in land for farming, provided themselves with arms, and built a fort. The place of course became a resort for fugitive slaves, and as such attracted the notice of our government. General Jackson, then commanding on the frontier, was instructed to notify the Spanish Commandant at Pensacola, that the fort must be destroyed, and he issued orders to General Gaines to destroy it accordingly, and to restore the negroes to their masters. Colonel Clinch attacked it by land, and Commodore Patterson by sea. It was blown up with hot shot, and about three hundred negroes were killed. The survivors were sent home to their masters. The army and navy of the United States had been out on a slave-hunting expedition, and had caught and butchered the blacks at the expense of the slavery-hating freemen of the North. The Indians resented the death of some of their friends in the negro fort, and thus began the first Seminole war, which involved us with Spain and England, and for a time threatened serious consequences with those powers.

General Jackson's campaign of 1818 quieted the Indians for a while, and in 1821 Florida became ours by purchase. The Indians in this territory, believed then to number about two thousand in all, scattered in little villages and hamlets, were collected into a tract, near the centre of the peninsula, where, notwithstanding the neighborhood of a strong military post, they continued still to harbor negroes. For this and other reasons, their presence was unwelcome, and in 1827, a proposal was made to them, on the part of the United States Government, to remove beyond the Mississippi; which, however, they positively declined to entertain. In 1832 the business was taken up again more resolutely, and, by the treaty of Payne's Landing, they consented to an arrangement, according to which, if a delegation from themselves to explore the country provided for their settlement, should return with a favorable report, they were to consent to emigrate.

This treaty was differently interpreted by President Jackson and the Indians. A large part of the nation, burning with a sense of

former wrongs, and believing themselves to be now over-reached and outraged anew, refused at all events to remove. The President sent a military force to compel their acquiescence, and at the close of 1835 another Seven Years' War broke out, in which a few miserable savages defied the whole power and resources of this vigorous nation. The President estimated the number of the Seminole warriors at four hundred. The Secretary at War rated it as high as seven hundred and fifty. The disbursing agent in Floirda reckoned the whole population, including men, women, and children, Indians and negroes, at three thousand. Against them, in addition to the regular troops, had been marshalled, as early as 1840, more than fourteen thousand volunteers from the neighboring States,* and in the middle of that year the expense already incurred had been estimated at twenty millions of dollars.† But the runaway negroes, more or fewer, whom a few hundreds of outlawed Indians could harbor, were to be caught again at whatever cost of American life and treasure. "I have to ask your particular attention" wrote the Secretary of War to the Commanding General, January 21st, 1836, "to the measures indicated to prevent the removal of those negroes, and to insure their restoration. *You will allow no terms to the Indians, until every living slave in their possession, belonging to a white man is given up.*" This was the great *sine quâ non* of a pacification. Without it, there must be interminable war. The North had plenty of lives and money to spare, and these must insure Georgia and Alabama against the loss of a single runaway negro. What worthier test could there be of Northern loyalty? What fitter use for Northern blood and money?‡

They did not quite get us into a war with England about the self-emancipated slaves of the Enterprise and Creole, but it is no thanks to Mr. Calhoun or his Thrasonic backers that they did not. It seemed at one time getting to be a very pretty quarrel, and had John Bull been a more favorable subject for Southern valor to practice upon, it may be that we should have argued it to the tithe part of a hair.

What has the North to do with the Slave Power? Just as much as belongs to its share of the waste, annoyance and disgrace which the cupidity of the wayward and domineering Slave Power is continually bringing on the country.

* Report of the Adjutant General, in *House Document*, No. 8, 26th Congress, 2d Session.

† Speech of Mr. Everett of Vermont, in the House, July 14th, 1840.

‡ An order of General Jessup, of August 3d, 1837, respecting captured property of the Seminoles, announces that "their *negroes*, cattle and horses, will belong to the corps by which they are captured." This was an army which we of the North paid to keep in the field. But *what has the North to do* with slaves? According to another order, (Sept. 6th,) "the Seminole negroes captured by the army, will be taken *on account of Government*, and held subject to the order of the Secretary of War."

NO. XIV.

WHAT HAS THE NORTH TO DO WITH IT? —THE NORTH DEFRAUDED AND BROW-BEATEN BY ITS COMMON LEGISLATION.

The common legislation of the dominant Slave Power is shamelessly unjust to the North. The Legislative records of every year contain the constantly accumulating evidence to this point. Nothing short of volumes would tell the story. Let us be content with a case or two, which are yet fresh in memory. Besides the tariff of 1846, which cripples Northern industry on so immense a scale, two instances have just occurred, which, of however inferior importance, are fair specimens of the style in which such things have been managed, ever since the Slave Power has had every thing its own way.

The United States owe a large sum to Massachusetts for military expenses, during the war of 1812. As to a portion of the claim, questions have been raised, whether the expenditure was under such circumstances, as to entitle to remuneration by the United States. But another large portion stands strictly on the ground of a *bonâ fide* debt, without any such doubtful principles to embarrass it. As such, to the amount of $250,000, more or less, it was long ago audited and allowed by the officers of the Treasury. But it cannot be paid without an appropriation by Congress; and that appropriation, being, as it is, due to Massachusetts, will be forth-coming from the Slave Power just at the happy time, when the Greek Calends come round. A clause, providing for it, was inserted in the last Appropriation Bill, but was struck out in the House. The party is content to take the position of a rich scoundrel, who owns that he owes, and says that he does not choose to pay.

At the time of the changes of government in France, fifty years ago, a large amount of property of northern merchants, estimated, if we recollect right, at some twelve millions of dollars, was captured on the high seas, without color of right, by armed vessels of the French Republic. Our government, as was its duty, claimed remuneration. The French, on the other hand, alleged causes of complaint against us. By the convention with Napoleon, of Sept. 30th, 1800, these reclamations were mutually abandoned. Each government, for a valuable consideration, discharged the other from its alleged obligations, and of course became answerable to its own citizens in the place of the party released. The Constitution says that "private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation." Here private property was taken for public use. The public bought certain treaty advantages; and the purchase money was a waiver of the indemnity due to certain American citizens from the foreign government. But that money was due at the North; the Slave Power was able to keep it from its owners; and it has kept it to this day.

Some of it belonged to rich men, and some to poor men, women and children. Three years ago, William Smith, an inmate of the poor-house at Northampton, a blind old man, of estimable character, formerly a thrifty ship-master, petitioned the Legislature of Massachusetts to interest itself with the General Government to obtain for him some portion of ten thousand dollars, of which he had been robbed more than forty years before by French privateers, and which, ever since 1800, the American Government had justly owed him, in consequence of the settlement in the treaty of that year. From the time of the treaty to this time, the claim has been repeatedly brought forward, about as often as there has been opportunity, amid the din of parties, for such a matter to get a hearing. As often as it has been listened to, it has gained the approval of most minds not dishonest. Committees have repeatedly reported in its favor. From time to time bills providing for it have been passed by one or the other House; but the Slave Power has always, till the last session, successfully resisted its passage through both. At length, at a late day of the recent session, the House passed a bill, in concurrence with the Senate, providing for compensation to the claimants to the amount of five millions of dollars, payable in land scrip, an utterly inadequate allowance, but still better than the nothing which had been given to the dead, and with which the survivors had had to rest so long dissatisfied. Whether the slave interest allowed this vote to pass, for the sake of conciliating favor, on the part of its friends, to some other measure, and with the knowledge that the President would interpose his authority to prevent its becoming a law, the public is not yet informed. That authority however he did interpose, the reasons assigned by him in his veto message being substantially that he wanted the money to carry on the war for the further establishment of slavery at the South, and that the justice of Congress was so sure and prompt, that, had the claim been a good one, it would long ago have been allowed and settled.

But these are only acts of dishonesty, which we can afford to put up with, disagreeable as it is to men or communities to be robbed of their honest dues. They are *repudiation*, to which the ruling spirit in the cabinet got well used before he came from his Mississippi home. Let them go. If the Slave Power can bear the infamy, we can bear the robbery. Only they deserve a passing word as indicating the feeling which exists among slave-holders towards the industrious part of the country, and that absence of all sense of justice which might not unnaturally be expected to take possession of those who are contented to live on the forced labor of others.

There are other wrongs, to which it is by no means so easy to be reconciled. *Freedom of speech and of the press* is a right of great consideration with us. Our ancestors, on the other side of the water, worked their way to it through many a weary and bloody struggle, and when we got it recognized in our Federal Constitution, we flattered ourselves, easy souls! that all was safe enough. How is it now? On the ques-

tion more interesting than any other of the present day to humanity and patriotism, a man cannot freely speak or print his mind and live, south of Mason & Dixon's line. There is no such *espionage* on the face of the globe, as that which is on the watch for this offence. France and Russia, in their most efficient plans of police, never imagined the like. It is not that the laws will make way with a man, but, — what is more certain, and less regular and decent, — that the neighbors will. Cassius M. Clay in Kentucky escaped with the breaking up of his press; but if they did not shoot or stab him, it was because he was reputed able (in the phrase of his country) to deal in that rough way with two or three times his own weight. Lovejoy they had shot for the same offence not long before. And that was in a State called free. But Alton was only distant by the width of the river from that Missouri, which we endowed with all the immunities of slavery five and twenty years ago; and it was not to be endured that a freeman should speak his mind so near to the *tabooed* ground, so long as cord or lead could stop him.

The practice of *petitions* on the part of the governed has been allowed by the harshest governments. We flattered ourselves we had done something safe, and something no more than reasonable, when, instead of an allowance, we had established in the Constitution, "the *right* of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." But the Slave Power, of late years, has not so much as permitted its northern vassals to petition. For ten years, the following atrocious provision stood among the Rules and Orders of the national House of Representatives; viz. that "no petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper praying the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or Territory, or of the Slave Trade between the States or Territories of the United States, in which it now exists, shall be received by this House, or entertained in any way whatever." Much as the Free States have shown themselves ready to bear, this bare-faced insult was found to be arousing their spirit, and making abolitionists among them, a little too fast; and at the commencement of the last Session, by a close vote, the Rule was repealed. But all that has been yet gained is, that such papers now get as far as the clerk's table, and there sleep the sleep of death.

What have men of the North to do with the Slave Power? It makes the national legislation insolently hostile to their rights and interests. It wrests from them the privilege of so much as making their sense of public grievances known to their rulers. And it silences the free voice and the free press which would rebuke the most frightful evil that afflicts the land.

NO. XV.

WHAT HAS THE NORTH TO DO WITH IT?—OUTRAGES ON NORTHERN CITIZENS.

In the year 1830, there sailed a ship from the port of Salem, in Massachusetts, called the *Friendship*. She carried dollars and opium, and went to the Island of Sumatra for pepper. The people of that hospitable region loved the coin and the drug, and one day when the captain, with part of his crew, was on shore, they visited the vessel, killed two of the men, drove the rest overboard, and helped themselves to her cargo. Such were the *police laws* of Qualla Battoo.

News of the transaction came to America. The American government was not satisfied with such treatment of its citizens, going about their lawful business. A big ship was fitted out, the Potomac, commanded by Commodore Downes. He anchored off Qualla Battoo, landed his ship's company by night, stormed the forts, put to the sword all the people he could reach, and reduced the settlement to ashes. And the people of the place have demeaned themselves quietly and peaceably to American visitors from that day to this.

About the same time, and since, certain other vessels, on their lawful occasions, sailed from Boston in Massachusetts, to Charleston in South Carolina. On their arrival, the people of that region came on board, took out certain individuals of their crews, and locked them up in jail on shore. When the vessels were ready to depart, they brought the men on board again, provided the captains would pay a ransom, called the expense of the detention, and enter into certain bonds. Otherwise the prisoners were sold into perpetual slavery. That all ever did get back again by this process to their vessels and their homes, would be an extravagant supposition; because, barring accidents, it is not an unheard of thing for a shabby ship-master, sooner than be put to trouble, to be willing to leave a man or two behind, where they would never be heard of more, particularly if he owed them either a spite or a large balance of wages. And such as were not thus brought back again were made slaves, they and their posterity forever. Such were the *police laws* of South Carolina.

There were some points of resemblance in the two cases, and some of difference. One of the principal differences was in the result. Qualla Battoo is in ruins, and Charleston stands to this hour. That the latter stands, is not through defect of right or power in the injured party. Right? "That may be called an equitable government," said an ancient sage, "in which an injury to the humblest citizen is resented as if done to the whole State."

Power? Of the counties of Massachusetts, there are not less than four, any three of which have an aggregate population greater than the free population of all South Carolina, — brave, hardy men, who went to school when they were boys, and go to church now they are grown up, with no domestic enemy to hamper them by their own beds and boards, with only love and loyalty on their hearth-stones. If there had been nothing to listen to but the maxims of harsher times, it would not have been six weeks after the first outrage, before it would either have been humbly atoned for, or a Massachusetts fleet would have been riding at the confluence of Ashley and Cooper Rivers, and Charleston would have been a heap of bloody ashes.

Police laws, indeed! Suppose the people of the Pepper Coast had said, We cannot get opium on the terms we like, without robbing your ships, and killing your people? What would our government have replied? Precisely what in substance it actually did; Get your opium cheap, or get it dear, or go without it; but touch a hair of the head of one of our people at your peril. And suppose the people of South Carolina say, We cannot have a comfortable enjoyment of slavery, which makes cotton and rice for us to be rich and luxurious with, unless, for its security, we imprison, whip, and sell free men and women of other States, — what is the natural and due answer? Raise cotton and rice cheap, or raise them dear, or raise them not at all; that is your affair; but as to imprisoning, whipping, and selling our people, that, at all events, you are not to do. Have slaves among yourselves, and make slaves of one another, or not, as may suit yourselves; but, at all events, make no slaves of us. We must come and go among you without molestation. If you say that these proceedings are essential to slavery, you only proclaim that the thing is too bad to be. Have a care that we do not take you at your word. If slavery be what you declare, slavery is a simply intolerable evil, and the whole civilized world, for its own safety, must combine for its extirpation. You only make out that its lair is a pirate's nest, and if so, it must be broken up forthwith, for the honor of humanity, and the quiet of decent people.

But the folly of the measure is not less signal than its impudent wickedness. Requisite for self-preservation? No such thing. Precaution? No; it is mere temper. It is only a spoiled child's rage. In the first place, they are not quite such arrant cowards as the plea pretends. Without entertaining any extravagant sense of the valor of the chivalry, or absolutely thinking them the fire-eaters that in one moment they profess to be, it would still be doing them sheer injustice to suppose that they are possessed by such craven alarms as, in the next breath, they put forward to excuse the barbarity in question. And, if they are so frightened, why do they let free white men from Massachusetts go at large on their shore, any more than black? Why do they not clap us in jail too, to be

ransomed out, or sold? Do they suppose that white Massachusetts men are less dangerous than black, because they have less *abolitionism* in them, or have less enterprise and contrivance to carry out an abolition scheme? Why do they not take British colored seamen out of their ships? Are British seamen less penetrated with abolition sentiments, or less likely to express them, than their fellows from New England? On the contrary, are they not ten times more so, from knowing they are subjects of a government that will not see them wronged? The Charleston people tried it once or twice with them. But the British Lion, as he lay coiled up sleepily in Downing street, heard from across the water the words of execration so familiar to his ear when any of his tars are in trouble, and he gave a growl and a snap,* and the Carolina people presently found out that it was perfectly safe to let British blacks come and go without hindrance or harm, even though they should be lately emancipated slaves from Barbadoes or Jamaica; while they cannot see to this day that it is at all safe to take the same course with blacks from Massachusetts. And accordingly there have been cases in which Massachusetts freemen, fleeing in the harbor of Charleston to British vessels, have found that protection under a foreign flag which the laws of their own country did not avail to afford.

The silly falsehood of its being a measure of self-preservation carries its refutation on its face. A poor fellow, shipping for Charleston from New England as steward or cook, will be pretty sure to let the people on shore alone, if they will only do the same kindness to him. He is trembling at the sight of his own shadow all the time he is in port. He hardly gets his head out of the camboose for a glance at the prospect, or a fresh gulp of air. He sees no one come on board that he does not turn blue with paleness lest the stranger should be for recognising him as the runaway Tom or Bill, who was *raised* by Colonel A. or the Reverend Mr. B. somewhere up the Santee or Edisto. Let him keep about his own business, Carolinians, and depend upon it he will not meddle with yours. But if you really want to make him dangerous, there is one effectual way to do it. Go on board the ship; order him over the side; row him on shore to jail. There he will be shut up with some hundreds of his own color, and they the most desperate characters of your city; for of course it was not sober and exemplary behavior that brought them together there. He will have facilities for a free, unrestricted, unwatched communication with them, night and day, such as no other place in Carolina would afford. If he is an abolitionist, put him there, and if he does not do his work thoroughly, he is a fool. If he is an abolitionist, and has any enterprise, you may chance to find that he has gone among

* Letters of Mr. Canning and Mr. Addington to the American Secretary of State, Feb. 15th, 1823, and April 9th, 1824.

you for the very purpose of taking advantage of your stupid law, and being put by you in the very place where he could desire to be in order to hatch a conspiracy. The wisdom of the *Southrons* (as, in their poetical vein, they call themselves) is, in this matter, only equalled by their courage. Neither would be the worse for a little self-collectedness and dignity.

We said there were some differences between the cases of South Carolina and Sumatra. Rigorously as our government saw fit to deal with Qualla Battoo, there was one thing about the matter that rather gravelled some of the more scrupulous civilians. We had no treaty with that amiable people. If they did not receive us to our mind, then, what breach of faith had we to punish? But with South Carolina Massachusetts had a treaty. It is written in the American Constitution, and it stipulates, among other things, that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." The people in question are our citizens. They were made so by the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780, of seven years earlier date than the Federal Constitution. Massachusetts never could, and never would, have given up the obligation of defending them, — by peaceable or by warlike protection, as the case might be. In the Federal Constitution she resigned the right to fight for them when injured, but not without demanding and receiving what she understood to be full security in another form, and what would have been full security, if the most bare-faced perfidy had not cancelled it. In the Federal Constitution, she entered into a compact of perpetual amity with her sister States. She relinquished her right to "keep troops, or ships of war" for her defence against them, in case of any wrong, and agreed that, instead, she and they would submit any dispute that might arise, to a common peaceful arbiter, the Supreme Court of the Union. And she kept her own pledge sacredly, as became her.

Mark the sequel. She receives that gross wrong at the hands of a sister State, which no community has endured, that has a name to live in history. Her citizens, without offence or allegation of any, are imprisoned, whipped, enslaved. Mindful of her faith and honor, — with all the right, and all the power to maintain it, — she seeks only peaceable redress. She calmly expostulates with the wrong-doer. Her remonstrances are thrown back with insult. She seeks the common inoffensive course for a legal remedy, but justice on the spot is stone deaf as well as blind, and she cannot get a hearing, nor, — such is the flagitious despotism of the public madness, — so much as an advocate to tell her story. Yet she must not leave any amicable means untried. She sends one of her honorable citizens, — a man of admirable probity, sobriety, experience, wisdom, — not to retort affront, not to threaten retaliation, not to exasperate bad and foolish passions already far too much inflamed, but simply *to go to law*, to present himself in the Courts,

where it had been dreamed that any American citizen was free to go, and have the question, whether it was or was not true, as South Carolina alleged, that citizens of Massachusetts might lawfully and rightfully be treated as they had been, — have this question, we say, quietly adjudicated by the authorized ministers of that *Law*, which is "the harmony of the world," and which must be the bond of this nation's peace and union, or there is none.

The question now changes its phase. It is no longer the whipping and selling of black men. It is the expulsion, or worse, of a white one, and he a man, than whom a more worthy or honorable never trod that unhappy soil. Carolina flies upon him. The Governor cries havoc to the legislative power. The Adjutant General dashes down by rail-road from Columbia, with military orders in his pocket sufficient to take care of an unarmed Yankee. A city mob threatens his life. A sheriff's officer assaults him in the street. A company of Charleston gentlemen, and a procession of coaches, conduct him and his young daughter to a steam-boat about to depart. The vessel is seen fairly out of the harbor, and South Carolina breathes freely once more; but not till she has passed an Act in five Sections, requiring the Governor, Sheriffs and other magistrates to protect her for the future, by measures of extreme violence and indignity, from all dangerous persons who may think to go to law within her borders to keep honest northern visitors of questionable complexion out of jails, hand-cuffs, and slave-markets.

Why amuse ourselves with the dream of the compacts or the powers of the Constitution affording us any protection against a faithless State, when things like these are done? And not by South Carolina alone. French, rigadooning Louisiana (hear it, ye stern shades of the Pilgrims!) imitated. Cherokee-hunting Georgia, — repudiating Mississippi, — perhaps other States of equally spotless fame, — by set resolutions approved. Justice, humanity, every inalienable prerogative which is man's by human birth-right, had been trampled on. The last remedy of States had been defied, in the consciousness of that impunity which the pledges of the injured party insured. The compacts of the Constitution had been iniquitously violated. It is not we that say so. It is the whole honest world, out of the infected region. It is every man of not perverted mind, who has wit enough to read its simple lines. The only one of South Carolina's own sons, before whom the question ever came under proper official responsibility, said so in as emphatic terms as it is possible for any of us to use.*

* "On the unconstitutionality of the law, under which this man is confined, it is not too much to say that it will not bear argument." — Opinion of Judge Johnson, of the Supreme Court of the United States, Aug. 7th, 1823, in the case of Henry Elkison *v.* Francis Deliesseline, Sheriff of Charleston District. The independence asserted by South Carolina of any jurisdiction of the Federal power in the matter, is another point of resemblance to the Sumatra people. "That part of the

What then? Violent remedies? Disunion? Retaliation? Prisons, stocks and lashes for South Carolinian travellers whom we may lay hands upon? Such might be the answers, if we did not live in the peaceable and reasonable nineteenth century, and if Massachussetts were not loyal to the affronted Constitution. But no. These are barbarous expedients. Away with the thought of any such. The man or the State, that has right on its side, can afford to suffer indignity and wrong. They can afford not to be impatient for redress. There is one thing much stronger than the fiercest injustice; and that is, the omnipotence of a righteous cause. Because there is a Providence above, and virtue in man, and a principle of good in affairs, therefore is it written with the certainty of fate, that violence and treachery sow the seeds of reparation and atonement. Time does not stop, and it will quickly enough do its office of bringing the fruit to ripeness.

Meanwhile, as to our question. *What has the North to do with the Slave Power?* It has outrageously maltreated our citizens. It has refused us a peaceable arbitration of differences. We thought, fought, worked and prayed hard, to get a Constitution adequate for the protection of the rights, with which, as we understood the matter, our Maker had invested us. The Slave Power has broken that Constitution down. Over a wide region, it has been made a dead letter, as far as our stipulated benefits from it are concerned. Have we nothing at all to do with that?

NO. XVI.

ITS TYRANNY OVER THE NON-SLAVEHOLDERS OF THE SOUTH.

In a few preceding papers has been considered, very cursorily and imperfectly, the impudent oppression exercised over us, the ten millions of people of the (so called) Free States, by the oligarchy composed of the one hundred thousand slave-holding voters. But bad as our case is, it is not nearly so bad as that of their five million non-slave-holding neighbors. The Slave Power administers both governments under which they live; the State, as well as the national. For us, the State governments, which after all manage our dearest interests, are free from its loathsome and withering touch. For them, every thing is at the mercy of the usurpers. Their op-

island is in the possession of the natives, who owe no particular allegiance to any foreign power, and *a very slight one, if any*, to the King of Acheen, who does not hold himself responsible for their outrages. * * * * * Their arrogance and treachery have of late years increased, and their aggressions were countenanced before hand by some of those in authority [in the nation]." Reynolds's "Voyage of the United States Frigate Potomac," p. 533.

pression is far the most extreme and pitiable. They are not permitted by their masters even to know its baseness and ruin, and this is even the worst aggravation. But they will know it. They belong to our party, the party of the free; and they will be found voting by our side. Theirs are the deepest wrongs, and from their awakened intelligence will come at length an effectual deliverance.

The slave-holder comprehends this perfectly well, and that is the reason why he is so determined to smother the freedom of speech and of the press, and why the sacredness of the post-office is invaded, that no matter relating to human rights may be circulated through it. It is not that he is afraid of discussions of this subject for the slave. The slave he well knows (thanks to his careful precautions!) cannot read them. To the slave they have no more meaning than so much unprinted paper. But he fears them for his white non-slaveholding neighbors, whom he has to oppress in oppressing the slave; who can most of them read; and who have the power to right themselves, when they come to comprehend their wrongs. It is the conscience, and sense of justice, and feeling of self interest, of the whites, that they fear lest we should reach.*

The laboring man in Massachusetts has every reasonable opportunity for improvement and advancement that money could buy, or heart desire. Every thing there is in him has its fair chance to come out. Within convenient distance of his dwelling, is a school. The public keeps the best schools in the Commonwealth; within its area of some 7800 square miles there are four or five thousand; and every child has a legal right to be taught in them. Within two or three miles of every man's hearth in Massachusetts, there is also a small select library, provided at the public charge. Intelligence comes with all this; and with it its beautiful train of order, industry, economy, thrift, self-respect, and mutual respect and kindness. Labor is honorable and honored in all its forms, and its social position, without any official advancement, is enough for a reasonable ambition. There is not an honest man in Massachusetts who is out of place in any place of dignity within her borders. Every prize is free to merit. Merit has a fair field. God gives the talent; the State provides the opportunities; earnest men apply the industry; and the result constantly before our eyes is, the attainment, from the humblest walks, of the highest elevation and the most brilliant prosperity.

* Something like this said, in the "United States Telegraph," Mr. Duff Green, than whom there can scarcely be a better authority on such a subject; "We do not believe that the abolitionists intend, nor could they, if they would, excite the slaves to insurrection. The danger of this is remote. We believe that we have most to fear from the organized action upon the *consciences* and fears of the slaveholders themselves; from the insinuation of their dangerous heresies into our schools, our pulpits and our domestic circles. It is only by alarming the consciences of the weak and feeble, and diffusing, among our people a morbid sensibility, on the question of slavery, that the abolitionists can accomplish their object." Mr. Green understands this matter much better than some of the Northern writers.

Turn to the laboring freeman south of the Potomac, and if you care nothing about slaves, care for your own color. Cock-pits, bar-rooms, horse-racing abroad; — squalidness, filth, scanty fare, shiftlessness, at home; — a pile of hewn logs to live in, with the crevices stopped with mud, and a shingle chimney; — no schools for the rude, unkempt children; no church for the harassed wife; no books by a comfortable fire-side; no feeling of equality; no dignity of manhood; no sense of consequence, except when an election comes round, and he goes to the County Seat, to be *treated* into a little more brutality, and give his vote for one or the other of the slave-holding candidates that band their forces to annoy us and ruin him. Of course, among persons so situated, there are those who overcome the unpropitious circumstances of their position, and come out brave, intelligent, self-respecting men notwithstanding. But they will be the first to understand that they have not had fair play, and that their fellows are very foully used.

Whose fault is it? Their own?* Would they not like to do better? Would they not like to change their condition for such a one as that of the industrious, intelligent, respected heads of families in our towns? Whose fault is it? Whose but that of their slave-holding neighbors, who, with a separate interest, take the power into their own hands, and use it for their oppression; who could not, in such a state of society, provide the means of popular instruction, if they would; who would not, if they could, because they could then no longer make the same profit as now, of the supineness, prejudices, and passions of ignorance; and who, by employing a kind of labor which they are at liberty to subject to all sorts of hardships and indignities, — whipping, branding, ironing, and selling at pleasure, — constitute an idle despotism the condition of honor, confound toil with servitude, and make industrious usefulness a badge of disgrace?†

Reader, if you have ever been in the South, you understand the phrase, *mean white men*, originated perhaps by the negroes, but in use among their betters. It does not stand alone for slave-catchers and slave-sellers by trade, degraded and brutified libellers of humanity, whom all, masters and slaves alike, scorn and abhor. It does not include only the overseers, coarse ruffians too often, hardened and irritated by their equivocal position, and wreaking with undiscriminating ferocity their vengeance for the contempt which they are conscious always attends their doubtful delegated power.

* It is amusing to advert to the statistics we lately presented of the proportion of persons in the Slave States unable to read and write, and then remember the judicious glorification of Chancellor Harper, of South Carolina: "It is by the existence of slavery, exempting so large a portion of our citizens from the necessity of bodily labor, that we have leisure for *intellectual pursuits*" — (Southern Literary Messenger for October, 1838.) Probably nothing like the worst is recorded in the Census, on this subject. Governor Campbell of Virginia told his Legislature in 1838, that it appeared from the returns of ninety-eight clerks, in the preceding year, that of 4614 applicants for marriage licenses, 1047 men could not write their names. Governor Hammond, of South Carolina, told his Legislature that the Common School System "is not suited to the genius of our people."

A *mean white man*, in a slave region, means every man who does not command the service of slaves. The masters look down upon him, and the slaves scarcely less. He is nobody's equal, except on the eve of an election. He is nobody's equal, then, any further than the need of his most sweet voice enforces an affected familiarity which to a noble mind would seem more offensive than insult. Small farmers working with their own hands on their own land, there are few or none. The culture of the country is carried on upon extensive estates, with machinery requiring large investments. Day labor on the properties of other men is not to be had. They would not consent themselves to plough and hoe in the same furrows with a degraded caste; and if they would, the masters do not want them. Mechanics there are few, and they of the most inferior kinds. If a Louisiana planter wants his broken-down coach mended, he must ship it to New York. A mechanic, hearing of the scarcity of industrious and capable people of his craft, and tempted by the prospect of high wages, comes to seek his fortune in such a region. Before ten or five years have passed, he has probably left his natural and proper way to competency and standing, and passed off in one or the other of two directions. He has either invested his first earnings in three or four negroes, and set up for a half-built, shiftless gentleman, or has broken down before arriving at this point, and joined the ragged company of loafers, who, because they are freemen, are too good to work. Or if he must do something to live, but cannot rein in his pride to work were there are rich white men and poor blacks to witness his dishonor, he has taken himself and his to the solitude of some Chuzzlewit's *Garden of Eden*,—overflowed a good part of the year,—and there, aguish and musquito-bitten, with his boat made fast to his door, in readiness to escape the flood, has become the gaunt, dismal monarch of all he surveys, the lonely lord of an acre or two of corn and some poultry, and of a wood-pile for the supply of the passing steamboats, which keep up his communication with mankind, and find him in pork and whiskey.

No community can be prosperous, where honest labor is not honored. No society can be rightly constituted, where the intellect is not fed. Whatever institution reflects discredit on industry, whatever institution forbids the general culture of the understanding, is palpably hostile to individual rights, and to social well-being.

That institution in the South is *Slavery*. There are four classes of persons who are greatly interested for its overthrow; 1. We of the North, whom through its political action it has shamefully wronged; 2. The slave-holders themselves, as in due time we propose to show; 3. The non-slave-holders of the South, whom, as an inferior *caste*, it condemns to degradation and imbecility; and 4. The poor negroes. Of these four classes, the Southern non-slave-holders are the greatest sufferers from it, except the slaves. Our wrongs, though, from our position, we may have more perception and resentment of them, are in fact inconsiderable in comparison.

NO. XVII.

IT EXISTS BY THE SUFFERANCE OF THE SOUTHERN NON-SLAVEHOLDERS.

The Richmond Whig of the 19th of August, referring to the humble labors of this press, expresses the opinion that, if they "should be sanctioned by the Whig party of the North, there will not be long a Whig party at the South at all;" and, "if ever the Whigs of the North shall surrender themselves to their guidance, they may rest assured that the party ties which now bind us together will be forever dissolved. It will no longer be a war of parties, but of sections, and when that battle is to be fought, the Southern Whigs will be found under the Southern flag."

Is not this modest? Who constitute that Whig party of the South, which is to be annihilated after this fashion? Whig slaveholders? Probably they make less than one-seventh part of it. There are about one hundred thousand slaveholding voters in the whole fourteen Slave States. When the Whigs manage to be one-half of them, which is not very often, then there is in those States an aggregate of fifty thousand Whig 'slave-holders' votes. Should what the Richmond Whig so fearfully deprecates ever come to pass, and Whig principles at the North be fully identified with free principles, it might lead to this enormous loss of strength in the national Whig vote of a million and a half. Why, in Massachusetts alone we have not far from fifty thousand democratic voters; but, with the blessing of Providence, the freemen of Massachusetts alone contrive to keep them in a hopeless minority.

The Richmond editor thinks that, when the Southern Whig slave-holders are dissatisfied by an adherence to Whig principles at the North, such as they cannot make up their own minds to imitate, they will be able to swamp the Southern Whig party. We make free to tell him, that herein he is utterly mistaken. We are bold to say, that never did partisan wiseacre make a falser calculation. Many of the Southern (so called) Whigs may go over to the other side; they will have no great distance to travel; — but in the meantime will have sprung up a large, brave, honest, available Whig party in that region, such as has been hitherto unknown, since slavery began to practice her sorceries. The Southern non-slaveholders belong of right to our party, — the party of the free. That is their natural position, and they are on their way to find it. The same abominable power which annoys us, and insults humanity, grinds them in the dust; spurns their honorable industry; dashes the bread of the intellect and the soul from their lips. They are about to understand this. And when they do, the Richmond Whig will find out by convincing tokens whether there can be a Southern Whig party after the North has come to be true to itself.

Many of the Southern Whig party are as little satisfied with its former leaders as we at the North with some of ours, and for the same reason. But the Southern leaders are not the party, and a change of them may perchance bring something very different from ruin.

At present, it is only in an exceedingly qualified sense, that there can be said to be more than one party south of the Potomac. The sub-party of the *ins*, and that of the *outs*, both belong, under their present leaders, to the party of Slavery. The one is in the habit of sustaining better men than the other, but as to their political principles, and their action on great measures, — *Tros Tyriusve*,— Whig or Loco Foco, — it does not much matter which you call them. In respect to what great question have not our calculations on Southern Whig aid in Congress misled and bogged us? In any pinch, when has not our reliance on Southern Whig votes proved a broken reed? Enough have generally remained on our side to join in our wail for the disappointment, but enough have generally gone over, — were more or fewer wanted, — to beat us in the vote. Of what earthly use to any cause, measure, party or thing, that calls itself *Whig*, are such Whigs as Mr. Hilliard of Alabama, and Mr. Jarnagin of Tennessee? They are Hushais in our Camp. If skilled in any thing, it is "to perplex and dash maturest counsels." There was not Whig doctrine enough in them even to sustain the Tariff of 1842, when the measure hung on the latter's single vote. No matter about Mr. Jarnagin, in particular. If he had not been on hand, to judge from past experience, the business would have been as effectually done by some other similar secession. When did a cardinal measure, identified in the popular apprehension with a triumph of the Slave Power, fail to be accomplished by Southern Whig votes, if it could not be accomplished without them? Will any body give us a definition of a *Southern Whig*, applicable to the year 1846? Of course, it must be broad enough to include Mr. Jarnagin, of Tennessee, whose vote passed Mr. Secretary Walker's anti-Tariff bill, and Mr. Berrien of Georgia, of the majority of the Committee that brought Texas into the Union on the Pilgrim Fore-fathers' Day.

Should a free expression of the principles of freemen "be sanctioned by the Whig party of the North, there will not be long," thinks the Richmond Whig, "a Whig party in the South at all." We entertain precisely the opposite opinion. We conceive that as the Whig North becomes in political action more true to its professions, there will be organized at the same time, at the South, a far larger party of true-hearted, earnest, substantial Whig patriots than has existed since the time of Washington. Just so far as we have been untrue to our principles, and played a cowardly game into the hands of slave-holders, we have given our aid to keep down, in ignorance and impotence, that vast body of freemen at the South, our natural allies, and establish in their place a greedy power, alike hostile to us and them.

Of the three millions, more or less, of voters in the United States, every man except some hundred thousand, is interested for, and would have his condition materially improved by, the overthrow of the Slave Power. These hundred thousand slaveholding voters control the government of fourteen States, and through them the government of the Union. And yet they constitute an exceedingly small minority, not only as compared with us, the freemen of the North, or with the negroes whom they hold in bondage, — neither of which classes can legally interfere with their political action in their States,— but also as compared with their non-slaveholding fellow-citizens, a class which shares with them the political franchise, and which suffers far more from their despotic mis-government than any other class except the wretched negroes.

In 1840, a census was taken by the authority of the Federal Government, and in the same year there was an animated Presidential election, which drew out a large vote. The free population of the Slave States, in that year, according to the enumeration, was 4,809,187. In the same year, the number of votes for Electors of President in those States (with the exception of South Carolina, which did not choose Electors by popular vote, but by the Legislature,) was 693,434. Supposing the proportion of voters to free population to have been the same in South Carolina as in the other Slave States, her voters, in a free population of 267,350, would have been 40,820; which number, added to the 693,434, gives an aggregate of 734,254 Southern voters. Of these, about 100,000 were owners of slaves. That is, in the Slave States themselves, the non-slaveholding exceeded the slaveholding voters in the proportion of more than six to one.

Now, if there be any truth whatever in the view, presented in our last number, of the depressed and oppressed condition of *free working men* in the Slave States, such vexations, disabilities, and wrongs, along with such power to redress them, are not going to last forever. The slaveholder does his best to perpetuate his baseless and precarious rule. He knows that he can only keep his power by emasculating the non-slaveholding freemen around him. He blinds and he stimulates them. He will give no schools to their children. He keeps them in an ignorance which would make it ridiculous for them to aspire to those places of public trust in which they might become dangerous to his views.* He plays upon their

* According to the census of 1840, the "scholars at public charge" in the Free States, numbered 432,173; in the Slave States, 35,580. Young Ohio had 51,812, nearly fifty per cent. more than the whole of them; Kentucky, 429. Virginia, the largest State, had 9,791; Rhode Island, the smallest, 10,912.

What comes of this want? Poverty of spirit, as well as barrenness of mind. Governor Metcalf, of Kentucky, in early life a stone-mason, afterwards a landed proprietor and slave-holder, is said to have made a great hit for popularity by an act of flattering recognition of his former craft. It happened that, at the time he was canvassing the State, the great Court House at Louisville was building. He went into the yard, and hammered some stone, and carried the votes of the masons with

sectional prejudices, and inflames the coarse unpatriotic passions that will serve his ends. Freedom of speech and of the press among them might soon bring them to an intelligence, and to conclusions, too threatening to his objects; so he throws dust in their eyes, and seduces them to part with these inestimable blessings of their birth-right, lest an *insurrection of the slaves* should follow from discussions which the slaves do not hear and cannot read.

But the spell is broken. This is not to be much longer. Brave men, who have not yet learned one-tenth part of their single power, are starting up in the slave States, to stand for freedom, and the rights of their much-injured class. Cassius M. Clay's paper, now transferred to hands not less able, and more true, is doing a great and blessed work in Kentucky. It is now passing through a crisis, but there can be only one result. The slaveholders have conspired in some parts of the State, to prevent its circulation. But they had better stop where they are; they may go further, and fare worse. The hardy working men have got fair hold of it, and it of them; and (thank God!) it is now a death-grasp, which neither guile nor force of slaveholders will any longer be able to loose. The same spirit is spreading in Western Virginia and Eastern Tennessee. It is kindled in North Carolina. Already it flames broad and bright in Maryland. That revolution is well begun, — its critical period is well nigh passed, — which is the surest of all never to go backward.

Some States—Mississippi, Alabama, Texas (if Texas be a State), —by way of making assurance doubly sure, have introduced provisions into their Constitutions, hampering their own Legislatures as to the power of dealing with this subject. But it will not all do. Constitutions, as well as Legislatures, are the creation of the popular will; and when free Southern working-men get their eyes open to their rights and wrongs, Constitutions, whenever there is need, will take a new shape accordingly. Justice, enthroned in the popular mind, has an orderly way to do its work of hamstringing

a rush. The incident shows the self-respect of the electors, quite as little as the candidate's good taste.

> "'Tis a stupid kind of cattle,
> Can be caught with mouldy corn."

Imagine such a stage-play to be enacted in Massachusetts, by any of her noble men who have risen to high station by virtuous industry. Imagine Samuel Appleton handling the scythe, or Charles Wells the trowel, or Samuel T. Armstrong taking a spell at the printing press, or William Sturgis at the capstan-spar, to help an election. Suppose it possible they should think of the thing,— which it is not,—who would there be to be practised upon by such a humbug? What would they get for their pains, but one universal guffaw of laughter? "Do you want to show us that you think there is nothing discreditable in our honest trade, to put us below such a great man as you? We never thought there was; and if you suppose we did, and that your condescending lesson on that subject is any gratification to us, you are too great a blockhead for us to vote for." That would be the substance of the answer.

abuses, despite all the artificial defences that selfish cunning may have donned.

"Stirrup, steel-boot, and cuish give way
Beneath that blow's tremendous sway."

The Southern gentlemen comprehend this quite as well as we do. "Ten long years of anxious sorrow" have passed since Mr. Nicholas, in the Kentucky Legislature, opposed the calling of a Convention to revise the Constitution, because, he said, the question of slavery will be brought up, and "the slaveholders in the State do not stand in the ratio of more than one to every six or seven." Yes, above all things let the slaveholders beware of popular conventions for revising Constitutions. Especially let such a measure be eschewed by the Richmond Whig and its compatriots; for, whenever there is a popular convention in Virginia, there will be a new distribution of power between the country east and west of the Blue Ridge, and after that is done, Virginia slavery may fold its robes and prepare to fall with decency.

Meanwhile, previously to, and independently of, any alteration of the organic laws, the great question of the age cannot long fail to force its way into the Southern Legislatures. With a majority of more than a half a million of votes in the slave country, it cannot be that the injured non-slaveholders will allow themselves always to be unheard. In some districts, the disproportion of blacks to whites is such as to give to non-slaveholders an immense majority, and an entirely undisputed control at elections ;* and it cannot be long before such districts, at least, will be represented by persons able to understand, and to stand up for, the rights of the *white working-man*. The question of popular education is already raised in some of the Slave States. That question cannot be long mooted, before the low condition,—rather the non-existence,—of such education, will be traced to its cause. That cause, that essential, omnipotent, all-deadly cause,—is, *Slavery*. So long as the black working man is held in bondage, just so long will and must the white man be held in miserable darkness and bondage of the mind. The momentous issue will soon be seen to be, continued and increased *depression of the non-slaveholding freeman, or manumission for the Slave*.

They must be courageous men who shall first proclaim that truth, in the face of the over-bearing will and marshalled energy of the Slave Power.† They must be men willing to risk their living and their lives. But there are brave spirits among the white laborers of the South, that know something of "the might that slumbers in a peasant's arm," and in what are better, a peasant's mind, soul, pen and tongue.

* In 1840, the whites were to the slaves, in Seavey county, Arkansas, as 311 to 1; in Brook county, Virginia, as 85 to 1; in Taney county, Missouri, as 80 to 1; in Morgan county, Kentucky, as 74 to 1.

† "Let us declare through the public journals of our country, that the question of slavery is not, and shall not, be open to discussion; that the system is too deep-rooted among us, and must remain forever; that the very moment any private indi-

They will proclaim the truth. They cannot be stopped from doing it. And when proclaimed in the right quarters, it will be widely recognised. And backed by a peaceful force of six to one, the event cannot long be doubtful. The Richmond Whig need be under no concern about the submersion of the Southern Whig party, on account of any greater vitality acquired by the free sentiments of the Whig creed.

If this way of thinking of ours is correct, it settles agreeably one or two questions.

In the first place, what the Richmond Whig says, that there "will no longer be a war of parties, but of sections," will not be true, but the diametrical opposite of truth. The free men of both South and North, who place their point of honor in *working* in some department, and doing something useful for themselves, their families, and their day and generation, will have a sympathy together, and a mutual respect which has never yet united them. The tyrannous domination of the *Slave Power*, building up a noxious element of discontent and dissention in one quarter,—this it is that has made sectional differences. Take that away, and the good and wise in both quarters will band themselves into one great national party of the *Federal Constitution*, and bring all sections and all interests into harmony.

In the second place, the business of *abolition* will be done by the proper constitutional hands. When the vast Southern majority of non-slaveholders have come to see how immensely it is their interest to abolish the evil that crushes out their moral life-blood, and how irresistible is their power to abolish it, the thing will be done, resolutely, but wisely and safely, as by those who, from personal experience, know thoroughly the exigencies of the case, and have the deepest stake in a quiet and prosperous result. It will be done by those who are able by peaceable voting and influence to coerce the masters, and at the same time, if need be, to protect them by controlling the slaves.*

If we may give a word of counsel to the masters, it shall be to point out in what quarter lies the real peril of their usurped power. It is a small matter to silence, disarm, and stultify black working men. That is but boys' play. If, in these critical times, they mean to do any thing to the purpose, let them take the bull by the horns, and silence, stultify, and banish their white working fellow-citizens. But unless we err, it is late in the day for that operation. The real

vidual attempts to *lecture us* upon its evils and immorality, and the necessity of putting means in operation to secure us from them, in the same moment his tongue shall be cut out, and cast upon the dunghill." So said the "Columbia (South Carolina) Telescope." The echo of the "Missouri Argus" was: "Abolition editors in the Slave States will not dare to avow their opinions. It will be instant death to them."

* "There is only one proper and effectual mode by which it [the abolition of slavery] can be accomplished, and that is by legislative authority; and this, as far as my suffrage will go, shall never be wanting."—GEORGE WASHINGTON. See letter to Robert Morris, dated 12th of April, 1786, in Sparks's edition, Vol. IX, page 159.

Southern Whig party among them, is in a fair way to be too clear-headed and strong for the plan to be thought on.

NO. XVIII.

WHO WILL BE HARMED BY ITS OVERTHROW?

CERTAINLY not the freemen of the North. Certainly not the non-slaveholding freemen of the South. Certainly not the slaves. And, as certainly, *not the masters.*

The highest interest of every man is his own character; — not his reputation, but his *character.* Nothing concerns a man so much as to avoid doing wrong. I can encounter no calamity so great as that of treating my brother wickedly. For that misfortune nothing can remunerate me. I shall do well to escape it by any sacrifice.

The slaveholder's life is a life of utter and perpetual injustice. The worst wrongs to which men are subject from their fellow man, he is day by day inflicting. He lives on their unpaid toil; he shuts against them the book of knowledge; he prevents them from the exercise of any virtue, except honesty and patience; he makes their intercourse together that of brutes, and forbids them to be in any reasonable sense of the words husbands and wives, parents and children; he fills their lives with hopelessness and wo.

He is sometimes refined and humane, you say. Very well. Then he is all the more susceptible of these considerations, and the more incapable of sitting down with an easy mind so long as the institution lives. For then he sees the more clearly its essential, inherent, ineradicable enormities. And he sees that, whatever may be his own disposition to mitigate them, one of the very evils of the condition is to prevent that disposition from prevailing to any great extent. He sees that one neighbor is avaricious, or intemperate, or spiteful, and then he will over-work, and half-clothe, and half-starve his negroes, or lacerate them with whips, irons, cat-hauling, and other tortures, at his wicked will; and that another is absent or indolent, and turns them over to the mercies of some gross savage, called an overseer; and that another is licentious, and then wo to the living chattels of his domestic sty. He considers that he himself is to die, and may be unfortunate first, and then what may become of the helpless dependents, whom he was inclined humanely to care for? In other words, what sort of security have they in his individual good sense and good will?

And he reflects, with bitter misgivings, that he is not even their master, so far as to be at liberty to consult his own kind feelings as to the amount of kindness he may do them. The stern *black code*

is the fierce master, to which he is himself in iron bonds. It fastens its fangs upon him more sharply than he is willing to do upon his blacks. It will not allow him to allow them to go free. It will not allow him to allow them to learn to read. It will not allow him to allow them to rise from being male and female beasts to be men and women. It represses and makes penal his humanity, while it annihilates theirs. Talk of being a master, indeed, under such circumstances! Talk of chivalrous spirit and independence! Talk of even such dignity as may belong to despotism! Why, the veriest wretch in a rice ditch, under an August sun, all one broil and fester from his recent scoring, is not so abject and pitiable a slave as the poor creature whom he calls his master. He is forced to suffer wrong in plenty, but not to do it. The slavery he is under, says to him peremptorily, You must be wretched; but it does not say, You must be pitiless and cruel. That intensest degradation and slavery is reserved for his owner. The heaviest tasked and most insulted slave in our slave country is the slave's lord.

There are men in the slave States, — slaveholders, — who feel the ineffable degradation of this position. Not only conscientious men, who abhor the injustice, but spirited men, who cannot brook the shame, are chafing impatiently under the yoke they wear, felt by them to be heavier and more dishonorable than that which they impose. They see their case themselves, and how ludicrously it belies that large prating, in the Bobadil vocabulary of *honor*, in which they have been wont to indulge. They perceive that others see their case also, and this renders them yet more uneasy. By all civilized communities except Brazil and the Spanish Colonies (if they be strictly within that pale) slavery and slaveholders are coming more and more to be treated like the luke-warm church in the third chapter of the Revelation; even the Bey of Tunis declines all relations with them, "for the honor of humanity, and that men may be distinguished from brutes." Right-minded persons of their number are distressed by this the more, in proportion as they see cause to acknowledge the justice of the sentence. Proud men, right-minded or not, cannot put it by with any affected unconcern. The sense of civilized and Christian man is as all-pervading as gravitation. Augur may keep augur in countenance a little while, and so may slave-holder slave-holder. But the consciousness of a false position is a perpetual distress. *Monstrari digito*, to be marked in other circles for an odious peculiarity, is just the more vexatious and intolerable, in proportion to the vaunts of consequence, and claims to observance, to which the party has been used. Many a slaveholder is sensitive to the discredit, who is not properly apprehensive of the wrong, and would be but too happy to take a fair place in the creditable world, cleansed from the nastily adhesive stigma.

After a man's own character, his next most anxious considerations are for his family. What a lot, for a reflecting parent to think of, to be obliged, by the necessity of the social system about

him, to bring up children in idleness, and contempt for useful employment, in the culture and exercise of the most boisterous passions, and exposed to the infinite bad example and temptation belonging to a household served by slaves! Read the lesson of the sagacious and experienced slave-holder, Jefferson, on this subject, recorded at a time when the evil was vastly less appalling, because less self-developed and less actively all-penetrating than at the present day. "The child * * * * nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances."

Mr. Jefferson's abrogation of the Law of Primogeniture has scarcely begun to do its work till this generation. It and Slavery are now working together in Virginia. A family is brought up, waited upon by slaves, and enervated and vitiated by intercourse with them, — the slave boys for their companions, and the slave girls constantly in their way, and altogether too much at their mercy. By and by the father dies, and the land and the hundred negroes, more or less, are divided equally among the children. The sons cannot live, — at all events, as they have been used to living. — on a piece of exhausted tobacco land, with a dozen or two of hands to till it. The professions are full; the trades are too vulgar for them; they have no way to get a subsistence. They sell off the human stock to Mississippi, Alabama, or Texas, and live on the proceeds as long as they last, and then become borrowing loafers about the Court House tavern, or take their departure for parts unknown. Or they carry to the Capitol their only capital, long so well accredited there, of "belonging to one of the first families in Virginia," get some small clerkship in some of the public offices, dress, drink, drab, and play to the limit of their slender salary, and so come to the

> "last scene of all
> That shuts this strange eventful history,
> In second childishness, and mere oblivion."

There are estimable youth in the slave-holding families of that region, that take neither of these courses, nor any thing like them. But the tendency of the deplorably vicious social system to multiply such histories, is too strong for a right-minded parent to contemplate without bitter anxiety.

In fact, there is many an anxious heart of fathers and mothers in in slave-holders' dwellings, daily and nightly brooding over these evils; and greatly welcome will be the relief to many a troubled breast, when the time comes for children to be bred in industry, and in exemption from corrupting domestic influences, and when "the freeman, whom the truth makes free," can say, Poor or rich, what I have is my own, the earning of my mind or my hands; the bread

I and mine eat, whether in plenty or penury, is not the bread of violence. No tears and blood of wretched vassals, leaven and sour it. No scarred, fettered, and imbruted image of God dragged itself forlorn along the furrow that bore it to me. Then

> "He can look the whole world in the face,
> For he owes not any man."

Now he owes every man, woman, and child whom the God-affronting law calls his own, and owes them far more for their wrongs and sorrows than Spanish mines could pay. To be delivered from the necessity of running any further in such a debt, will be an unspeakably joyous emancipation, to many a spirit that now muses and sighs in secret.

NO. XIX.

WHO WILL BE HARMED BY ITS OVERTHOW?—PRUDENTIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE SLAVE HOLDER.

A Slaveholding community lives in perpetual uneasiness and alarm. The master's house on a plantation is a little citadel, armed in preparation for the worst. The negroes must not meet in assemblies for religious purposes, except under strict restraints. They must not leave the estate where they belong, without a pass. In the cities, the drums beat at nine o'clock; the guards take their stations; and the blacks must house themselves for the night. In the midst of Charleston, is a sort of castellated building, provided for a place of refuge to the inhabitants in case of an outbreak. Every thing betokens a never-sleeping vigilance against apprehended assaults from a desperate domestic enemy.

What comfort can there be in living so? It would be disagreeable enough to be always on the-look out for an invasion from abroad; but to pass life in continual apprehension of murderous foes in one's kitchen, hall, and bed-chamber, is incomparably a more unenviable lot. "A state of *military preparation*," said Governor Hayne, to the South Carolina Legislature, in 1833, "must always be with us a state of perfect domestic security. A profound peace, and consequent apathy, may expose us to the danger of domestic insurrection." "We of the South," says the Maysville Intelligencer, "are emphatically surrounded by a dangerous class of beings,—degraded and stupid savages, who, if they could but once entertain the idea that

immediate and unconditional death would not be their portion, would re-enact the St. Domingo tragedy."

Bad as the case is already, it is in some quarters becoming constantly worse. In 1790, the slaves were, in South Carolina, about two-fifths of the population; and in North Carolina, about one quarter. In 1840, they were in South Carolina far more than half, and in North Carolina nearly one-third; while in Mississippi they have increased from three-eights of the population in 1800 to more than half in 1840. The annual increase of slaves in the whole country is estimated at from seventy-five to eighty thousand, equal to one tenth part of the population of Massachusetts. If the danger is already great from such a host of domestic enemies, what is time doing with it?

Yet so marvellously Bœotian, so fatly stupid is the infatuation on this subject, that you hear sensible people talk as if there would be danger in unlocking the fetters of these millions of victims, while the course of safety is in holding them in continued bondage by all the means of outrageous violence necessary to effect that object. As if, on any known principles of human nature, such a multitude could never be provoked to resistance and vengeance as long as you treated them grossly ill, but the moment you did them justice, and conferred upon them the boon of all blessings that the heart of man most longs to possess, that moment they would turn upon you, and make you and yours the victims of their unpitying rage.

Whether, and how far, the throwing off of this intolerable load may involve sacrifices of property, are questions which may be considered hereafter. But it will involve no sacrifices of peace and personal safety. That is all a craven and senseless alarm. The whites in the fourteen Slave States are more numerous than the slaves in the proportion of five to three, if that were the only consideration; and in only two of those States, South Carolina and Mississippi, do the blacks constitute the majority of the population. Most of the Slave country is flat, affording no advantage of position to counterbalance that of numbers. But the decisive consideration is, the superior intelligence, organization, and resources of the whites, affording them perfect security even against greatly superior numbers. As long as the provocations of slavery continue, there may be hazard of passionate and desperate insurrections, which may do much mischief before they are suppressed. But no motive, short of the fury of anger and despair, could be sufficient to marshal an opposition to the concentrated and disciplined power of the white people; and the possibility of any impulse of that sort would be done away, as soon as the boon of liberty, — all that it would aim at, — had been freely bestowed.

But what seems matter of such easy demonstration has been at length proved in the experiment, and so well that it is now no better than impertinence to hold the opposite argument. On the one day

of August 1st, 1834, eight hundred thousand slaves were set free in nineteen English colonies of the West Indies. Many of their masters had affected to portend all the horrors that the fancies of American masters picture at the present time. Nothing short of sweeping in a flood of havoc over the islands, burning the plantations, and carrying murder and nameless outrages into every dwelling, it was said, would suffice to surfeit the hoarded vengeance of years. But not an act of violence stained that magnificent triumph of Christianity and freedom. Universally the hearts of the poor emancipated creatures were big with gratitude, not with fury. Dilated with love for the partners, children, and homes they might henceforward call their own, their bosoms had no room for hatred of the oppressor whose rod was now broken; and from that day to this, twelve years, there has been no insurrection or violence of the laborers, but on the contrary, a peaceable and orderly condition of things which would do honor to any civilized community.

The experiment in the British West Indies was made under no peculiarly favorable circumstances. On the contrary, in the island of Jamaica, in particular, which contained half the slaves, some of the circumstances were as unpropitious as could well be. Four hundred thousand blacks against forty thousand Europeans, the latter would have been but a mouthful for their vindictive appetite. The chain of high mountains, which runs through the centre of the island, offers fastnesses which would have fully compensated to insurgents any want of military skill. Nor had unnecessary provocation been wanting. The ill-advised planters of Jamaica had done all in their power to resist and thwart the generous policy of the mother government. Nothing had been done by them to conciliate their bondmen against the critical day of liberty, but the reverse. It was hardly possible to submit to an unwelcome necessity with a worse grace. To the last hour they did much of what was in their power to tempt vengeance, but they did it all in vain.

Whether there is danger in the present state of things in our Slave States, let all judge who know the facts. It is a subject we cannot bear to pursue. But in the process of emancipation there is no danger. That is a certain course of safety, for the present and the future.

NO. XX.

WHO WILL BE HARMED BY ITS OVERTHROW?—ECONOMICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE SLAVEHOLDER.

Mr. Clay said, in a famous speech, that the value of slaves in the Union was twelve hundred millions of dollars; and how, he asked, could it be expected that the South would ever consent to sacrifice that vast amount of property by emancipation?

We hold this view to be demonstrably and utterly false. More; we hold that emancipation would be a good economical operation.

1. Why is a slave of any value? He is good for nothing, merely as a slave. His bones and muscles are worthless to you, independently of the use you can put them to. He is of value, because he is a machine for raising sugar, tobacco, rice, or cotton. His value represents the net proceeds of his labor,—neither more nor less.

2. "But we get his labor without wages." No, you do not. You do not call what you pay him *wages*. But you pay him, in kind, food and clothing for himself and his family, which food and clothing hired laborers use their wages to buy. We find the average cost of supporting slaves rated at a dollar a week, or fifty dollars a year. That estimate is probably too high, but the amount is of no consequence to our argument. At all events, you give him *something*, to keep him alive and in working condition. You have to give him something; else he would die; and there would be the end of your property in him.

3. It is ruinous economy to give small pay for the grudged and clumsy labor of a slave, instead of giving larger for the cheerful and intelligent labor of a freeman. We of the North, who have the credit of knowing about these things as well as most people, understand perfectly well that we cannot afford to pay low wages. Low wages buy only unskilful service. A farm, or a factory, or a shop, involves an investment of capital. It does not answer for us to have the interest running on, without employing the best kind of labor we can procure, so as to get back the best return. Good labor costs more money; but to pay it, we find to be the only good thrift. We cannot afford to have every thing continually getting out of order, for want of skill, economy, forethought, and management in the operatives. We cannot afford to have the master constantly harassed and taken off to patch up his workmen's shiftless work, and keep them at their business. At Lowell, where there is seen the perfection of plan and method, they will scarcely look at a Manchester operative, whom they can have for little more than enough to keep him alive. Nothing will suit them short of the well-trained people from our common schools, to whom they must allow a compensation sufficient to give them lessons in French and music, be-

sides making deposits in the Savings Bank; and the highest paid labor is the most profitable to the employers. The same principles apply to the management of a plantation, if their owners would but see it. If they mean to keep rich, and grow richer, they will do well to take a leaf out of our book.

4. What are the cotton and sugar estates good for, except for what they will produce? Of course, the value of their product is the measure of their own value. As long as, from the existing system, they are doomed to be tilled by lazy and awkward hands, kept in motion by nothing but fear of the lash, their value is kept down. Give them a better tillage, as you will when you place upon them laborers excited to do their best by a sense of direct personal interest, and their value immediately rises in proportion to the increased amount and value of the production; and the proprietor is more than compensated for his increased outlay upon labor by the advance in the income and appraisement of his real estate. Unless we are as blind as moles, not a dollar of property would be lost in the South by the abandonment of its nominal ownership of twelve hundred millions of dollars in slaves. On the contrary, the rise of other property, consequent upon that step, and impossible without it, would more than make good the supposed deficit.

Let us illustrate by a story, which we find in a "Cincinnati Gazette," of March, 1843, of a proceeding of Mr. McDonough of Louisiana, with a portion of his slaves. We have conversed with Mr. McDonough, and learned some further particulars. But those which are recorded are sufficient for our purpose.

"In 1842, Mr. McDonough, residing opposite New Orleans, liberated 80 slaves and sent them to Liberia. The history of this event is thus related by himself:

"Feeling the necessity of keeping the Sabbath holy, he would not allow his slaves to work on that day. Experience, however, soon convinced him that men who toiled six days for their master needed many things which he could not give them. To enable them to do this, he allowed them half of Saturday, that is, from midday till night, to work for themselves.

"Seeing the amount of money the slaves accumulated in this way, he was led to calculate how long it would take them to purchase the remaining five and a half days. The result proved that it could be done on the Sabbath day,) your first object will be to gain a sufficient sum of money to purchase the other half of Saturday, which is one-eleventh part of the time you have to labor for your master, and of consequence, the one-eleventh part of the value your master has put upon you, and which you have to pay him for your freedom. [This, I notify you, will be the most difficult part of your undertaking, and take the longest time to accomplish.] It is to be effected by laboring for me on Saturday afternoons, and leaving the amount of your labor in my hands to be husbanded up for you. By foregoing every thing yourselves, and drawing as little money as possible out of my hands, I calculate you will be able to accomplish it in about seven years; that once accomplished, and one day out of six your own, you will go on more easily and rapidly; indeed, that once effected, your success is certain; proceeding then

on in your good work, you will be enabled easily, by your earnings on one entire day in each week, to effect the purchase of another day of your time, in about four years. Now master and owner of two days in each week, you will be able in two years more to purchase another day, so that three days, or one-half of your time, will be your own; in one and a half years more you will be able to purchase another day, making four days your own; in one year more, another, or the fifth day; and in six months, the last day, or the whole of your time, will be your own.

"The results of the experiments were these. In less than six years, the first half day was gained and paid for by them. In about the next four years the second day of the week was paid for and their own. In about two and a quarter years, the third. In fifteen months, the fourth. In a year, the fifth. And in about six months the last, or sixth day became their own, and completed the purchase, effecting their freedom in about fourteen and a half years. It could have been sooner done, but towards the last they drew more money. After this it took them nearly five months to pay the balance due on their children, added to what the youths (boys and girls) had earned. On the morning of the 8th of June, 1842, they all sailed for Liberia."

* * * * * * * * *

Mr. McD. calculated, "that their labor would be given with all the energy of heart, soul and physical powers, that they would in consequence accomplish more labor in a given time, than the same number of persons would in ordinary circumstances, and that in addition, they would labor some two, three or four hours more of the twenty-four, than other slaves were in the habit of doing or would do," and he says:

"From the day on which I made the agreement with them, (notwithstanding they had, at all times previous thereto, been a well-disposed and orderly people,) an entire change appeared to come over them; they were no longer apparently the same people; a sedateness, a care, an economy, an industry, took possession of them, to which there seemed to be no bounds but in their physical strength. They were never tired of laboring, and seemed as though they could never effect enough. They became temperate, moral, religious, setting an example of innocent, unoffending lives to the world around them, which was seen and admired by all. The result of my experiment in a pecuniary point of view, as relates to myself, is not one of the least surprising of its features, and is this, that in the space of about sixteen years, which those people served me, since making the agreement with them, they have gained for me, in addition to having performed more and better labor than slaves ordinarily perform, in the usual time of laboring, a sum of money (including the sum they appear to have paid me, in the purchase of their time,) which will enable me to go to Virginia or Carolina, and purchase a gang of people, of nearly double the number of those I have sent away. This I state from an account kept by me, showing the amount and nature of their extra work and labor, which I am ready to attest to, in the most solemn manner, at any time."

But men standing up as they, active, brisk in look and walk, showing vigor, attracted a good deal of attention. Mr. McD. relates the following anecdote illustrating this point:

His head brick-layer Jim, attracted the attention of a Mr. Parker in New Orleans, where he had 30 or 40 of his men at work. He desired to buy him, and made an offer. It was refused. He repeated that offer. Mr. McD. said he never sold. Meeting him again he increased the sum, offering at last $5,000 for Jim, when he was peremptorily refused. The following conversation occurred:

"Mr. Parker finding at length, from the refusal of such a large sum of money for him, that there was no hope of obtaining him, observed to me, Well then, Mr. McDonough, seeing now that you will not sell him at any price, tell me what kind of people are those of yours; to which I replied, How so, Mr. Parker, I suppose they are like other men; flesh and blood, like you and myself; when he replied, Why sir, I have never seen such people; building as they are next door to my residence, I see and have my eye on them from morning till night. You are never there, for I have never met you, or seen you once at the building; tell me, sir, said he, where do those people of yours live; do they cross the river morning and night? I informed him that they lived on the opposite side of the river

where I lived myself, and crossed it to their work, when working in New Orleans, night and morning, except when stormy, (which happened very seldom,) when I did not permit them to cross it, to endanger their lives; at such times, they remained at home or in the city. Why sir, said he, I am an early riser, getting up before day; and do you think that I am not awoke every morning in my life, by the noise of their trowels, at work, and their singing and noise, before day; and do you suppose, sir, that they stop, or leave off work at sun-down? no, sir; but they work as long as they can see to lay brick, and then carry up brick and mortar for an hour or two afterwards, to be ahead of their work the next morning. And again, sir, do you think that they walk at their work? no, sir, they run all day. You see, sir, said he, those immensely long ladders, five stories in height; do you suppose they walk up them? No, sir, they run up and down them like monkeys the whole day long. I never saw such people as these, sir; I do not know what to make of them; were there a white man over them with a whip in his hand, all day, why then I should see and understand the cause of their running, and incessant labor; but I cannot comprehend it, sir; there is something in it, sir; there is something in it. Great man, sir, that Jim; great man, sir; should like to own him. After having laughed very heartily at the observations of Mr. Parker, for it was all truth, every word of it, I informed him that there was a secret about it, which I would disclose to him some day, and we separated. Now, Mr. Parker imputed the conduct of these people, for I have given the very words and expressions he used, and he is alive, hearty and well in New Orleans, and can be spoken to by any one interested in the subject, to the head man who conducted them, and in consequence, impressed with that belief, offered me five thousand dollars for him; but Mr. Parker knew not the stimulus that acted on the heart of each and every one of them; that it was the whole body of them that moved together as one mind; not one alone, the head man, as he supposed."

* * * * * * * * *

"The ship in which they sailed for Africa floated opposite my house, in the Mississippi, at the bank of the river; I had taken my leave of them on going on board the ship, on Friday evening, the day previous to her sailing, in my house. The scene which there took place, I will not attempt to describe. It can never be erased from my memory."

* * * * * * * * *

"After seeing them on, (the ship was taken by a steamer,) Mr. McLain came into my house, as I was expecting him to breakfast, and on seeing him much affected in his manner, (a tear standing in his eye,) I inquired if any thing had taken place to give him pain; to which he replied, "Oh, sir, it was an affecting sight to see them depart. They were all on the deck of the ship, and your servants who have not gone, were on the shore bidding them farewell, when from every tongue on board the ship, I heard the charge to those on shore, '*Fanny, take care of our master.*' '*James, take care of our master; take care of our master; as you love us, and hope to meet us in heaven, take care of our beloved master.*'"

What do these details amount to? They amount to this: That these slaves, in sixteen years, *besides doing for their master all the work expected from them as slaves*, did, under the new stimulus of hope and the proper excitements of a rational being, as much *additional* work as equalled the total amount of work expected to be done by them *in their whole lives*, beginning at the time when the plan went into operation,— because the expected product of their whole lives' labor was of course the measure of the price, set upon them respectively, and which they were required to earn in order to buy their freedom. In other words, the introduction of the new element of personal interest, and an intelligent hopeful purpose, made their labor, in sixteen years, to be worth as much as otherwise the total labor of their whole lives, *plus* the labor of sixteen years of the prime of it,

would have been worth. Is that an economical lesson worth a slaveholder's attention?

Nor is this all. It seems to be only half of the truth. "In the space of about sixteen years," says Mr. McDonough, "they have gained for me, in addition to having performed more and better labor than slaves ordinarily perform, in the usual time of laboring, a sum of money (including the sum they appear to have paid me, in the purchase of their time,) which will enable me to go to Virginia or Carolina, and purchase a gang of people of *nearly double* the number of those I have sent away." The *surplus* labor of their sixteen years, under the newly infused impulse, was not only sufficient to buy themselves, but to buy nearly as many more such. In other words, if we understand the statement, the surplus labor of *eight* years, when the thing came to be seen to the bottom, amounted to what was expected from the labor of their whole lives as slaves, with that of the time given to buy themselves added.

Will any body tell us why what proved true of Mr. McDonough's eighty bondmen would not, on the whole, prove equally true of eighty thousand; and that the labor of any number, in freedom, would not turn out to be worth to their employers as much more than their labor in slavery? We anticipate the reply that the *hope* of emerging from servitude to liberty was to these slaves a stronger motive than would be, to one already a freeman; the mere hope of bettering his condition. And we allow force to the suggestion. But we set off against it the consideration of the greater intelligence and capacity acquired by the training which freemen would command, and which these poor people wanted. With all their alacrity and good will, still they were only slaves. They had nothing to turn to account but their hands. They could neither read, write, nor cipher; and they were enfeebled by all the moral disabilities of their early condition. With the minds of freemen, under the same stimulus, they would have made shorter work.

NO. XXI.

WHO WILL BE HARMED BY ITS OVERTHROW?—ECONOMICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE SLAVEHOLDER.

The last number of these papers contained an account of an experiment made by Mr. McDonough of Louisiana with eighty slaves, showing that, in converting them to freemen, he made a good speculation. A different experiment of the British Parliament on eight hundred thousand, justifies similar conclusions.

Mr. Gurney, a Quaker, a man marked by the shrewdness as well

as by the sincerity and benevolent temper of his sect, visited the British West India islands in 1840, when the experiment of cultivation with emancipated slaves had been six years in progress. We extract some striking specimens of his testimony on the subject.

At St. Christopher's he visited the plantation of Robert Clayton, Solicitor General of the Colony.

"Speaking of a small property on the island belonging to himself, he said 'Six years ago (that is, shortly before the act of emancipation,) it was worth only £2000, with the slaves upon it. Now, without a single slave, it is worth three times the money. I would not sell it for £6000.' This remarkable rise in the value of property, is by no means confined to particular estates."—*Familiar Letters to Henry Clay*, &c. p. 35.

"In this island the negroes perform a far greater quantity of work in a given time, than could be obtained from them under slavery. 'They will do an infinity of work,' said one of my informants, 'for wages.'"

At Antigua;

"On my inquiring of them [Sir William Colebrook, Governor General, and Mr. Gilbert, a clergyman] respecting the value of landed property, their joint answer was clear and decided. 'At the lowest computation the land, without a single slave upon it, is fully as valuable now, as it was, including all the slaves, before emancipation.' Satisfactory as is this computation, I have every reason to believe that it is much below the mark."—*Ibid*, p. 43.

"We understood that he [Mr. Gilbert] received $25,000 as a compensation for his slaves. He assured us that this sum was a mere present put into his pocket; a gratuity, on which he had no reasonable claim. Since his land, without the slaves, is at least of the same value as it was, with the slaves, before emancipation, and since his profits are increased, rather than diminished, this consequence follows, of course."—*Ibid*, p. 44.

"We were now placed in possession of clear documentary evidence respecting the staple produce of the island. The average exports of the last five years of slavery (1829 to 1833 included,) were, sugar, 12,189 hogsheads; molasses, 3,308 puncheons; and rum, 2,468. Those of the first five years of freedom (1834 to 1838 inclusive,) were, sugar, 13,545 hogsheads; molasses, 8,308 puncheons; and rum, 1,109 puncheons; showing an excess of 1,356 hogsheads of sugar; and of 5000 puncheons of molasses; and a diminution of 1,359 puncheons of rum. * * * * * It ought to be observed, that these five years of freedom included two of drought, one very calamitous. The statement for 1839 forms an admirable climax to this account. It is as follows; sugar, 22,383 hogsheads (10,000 beyond the last average of slavery); 12,433 puncheons of molasses (also 10,000 beyond that average); and only 582 puncheons of rum."—*Ibid*, p. 53.

At Dominica, the information obtained was

That "the negroes were working delightfully," and that "they were working cheerfully, and cheaply to their employers as compared with slavery."—*Ibid*, p. 62.

At Jamaica,

"Under slavery, two hundred slaves were supported on Papine estate; now it is worked by forty-three laborers." "One hundred and seventy slaves, or apprentices, used to be supported on this estate [Halberstadt]. Now our friend employs fifty-four free laborers, who work for him four days in the week, taking one day for their provision grounds, and another for market. This is all the labor that he requires."—*Ibid*, pp. 77, 83. The support of the slaves on this property under the

old system had cost £850 annually; the annual wages of the free laborers amounted to £607.10. *Ibid.* In the parish of St. Mary, "in the laborious occupation of *holeing*, the emancipated negroes perform double the work of the slave, in the day. In road-making, the day's task, under slavery, was to break four barrels of stone. Now, by task-work, a weak hand will fill eight barrels; a strong one, from ten to twelve barrels."—*Ibid*, p. 89. "Our friend [George Marcy] a few years since had sold a certain sugar estate, called G——, for the trifling sum of £1500. 'And what dost thou suppose to be the value of that property now, friend Marcy?' said one of our company. 'Ten thousand pounds,' was his immediate reply."—*Ibid*, p. 111.

"'I had rather make sixty tierces of coffee,' said A. B., 'under freedom, than one hundred and twenty under slavery; such is the saving of expense, that I make a better profit by it; *nevertheless, I mean to make one hundred and twenty, as before.*'"—*Ibid*, p. 118. "Do you see that excellent new stone wall round the field below us?' said the young physician to me, as we stood at A. B.'s front door, surveying the delightful scenery. 'That wall could scarcely have been built at all under slavery, or the apprenticeship; the necessary labor could not have been hired at less than £5 currency, or about $13 per chain. Under freedom, it cost only from $2.50 to $4.00 per chain, not one-third of the amount. Still more remarkable is the fact, that the whole of it was built under the stimulus of job-work, by an invalid negro, who, during slavery, had been given up to total inaction!' This was the substance of our conversation; the information was afterwards fully confirmed by the proprietor. Such was the fresh blood infused into the veins of this decrepid person by the genial hand of freedom, that he had been redeemed from absolute uselessness, had executed a noble work, had greatly improved his master's property, and finally had realized for himself a handsome sum of money."—*Ibid*, p. 119.

"'I know the case of a property,' observes Dr. Stewart, 'on which there were one hundred and twenty-five slaves, the expense amounting (at £5 per annum for the maintenance of each slave,) to £625. The labor account for the first year of freedom, deducting rents, was only £220, leaving a balance, in favor of freedom, of £400. More improvement had been made on the property than for many years past, with a prospect of an increasing extent of cultivation. On a second property, the slave and apprenticeship expenses averaged £2400; the labor account, for the first year of freedom, was less than £850. On a third estate, the year's expense, under slavery, was £1480; under apprenticeship, £1050; under freedom, £637. On a fourth, the reduction is from £1100 to £770.' 'I believe in my conscience,' says the same gentleman, 'that property in Jamaica, without the slaves, is as valuable as it formerly was with them. I believe its value would double, by sincerely turning away from all relics of slavery, to the honest free working of a free system.'"*—*Ibid*, pp. 120, 121.

The "Letters on the Slave Trade, Slavery, and Emancipation," by G. W. Alexander, two years later than the work of Mr. Gurney, confirm his representations in essential particulars. He says (p. 80),

"In British Guiana, "a colony which has suffered more from drought than any other since the introduction of freedom, and where, in consequence of this circumstance and others to which reference has been made, the exports of sugar have lessened considerably, eighteen estates have been sold subsequently to the Abolition Act coming into effect, which have realized in almost every instance, as much as would have been obtained for them, *together with the slaves*, during the period of slavery. Property in Georgetown, in the same colony, has increased in value from 8,133,070 guilders, to 9,981,550 guilders, or 1,848,490 in the space of three years, between 1836 and 1839; the former year being the

* At that vast and admirably managed establishment, the St. Charles Hotel in New Orleans, we observed, in 1843, that all the servants were free. They must have been brought and kept there at great expense, but it was genuine economy. The head of the house was from Lynn in Massachusetts, and understood these things.

time of the apprenticeship." Again, (p. 165): "The value of the slaves [in the Spanish Islands] would, as a natural consequence, be transferred to the soil, and such has been the case to a very great extent in the British West Indies. In a very large proportion of instances, estates can now be sold for as large a sum as could formerly be obtained for them with the slaves attached. In towns, also, a great increase has taken place in the value both of land and houses."

In illustration of the increase of profitable industry in later years, we give the following statement of the exportation of sugar, the principal product of the British West India Islands :—

In 1841,	121,295	hogsheads,	12,225	tierces.
1842,	135,910	"	15,985	"
1843,	141,100	"	13,640	"
1844,	138,150	"	16,395	"
1845,	157,200	"	20,075	"

No doubt, from temporary causes, partly incident to the change in the nature of labor, and in part wholly extraneous to that question, the *exportation* of the staples suffered some decrease. But *exportation* is not the standard of lucrative industry, nor of the rents, profits, or wealth of proprietors. No small quantity of the sugar, molasses, coffee, and other commodities, which before emancipation had nearly all been sent abroad, was from that time consumed by the blacks, who paid as much for it to the land-holder as the foreign consumer had done, perhaps more. And suppose, instead of raising as much sugar as before, the negro chose to turn part of his industry into the cultivation of yams, bananas, plantains, pine apples, and other fruits and vegetables for his family or for the market, what did the landlord lose by that? What, rather, did he not gain? For, of course, the better the tenant could suit himself with his farming, the more rent would he be willing to pay. Undoubtedly, in the long run, the most profitable products will receive the most cultivation, and rent and value will keep pace with products, whether *exported* or consumed at home. Certainly we have discussed tariff principles in this country, enough to understand that a home market may be as good, or better, both to the laborer and land owner, than a foreign one.

We cannot so much as glance at all the aspects of this great subject, but we must not leave it without a single word about the other side of the custom-house ledger.

"The change for the better," says Mr. Gurney, (p. 36), "in the dress, demeanor, and welfare of the people, is prodigious. The *imports* are vastly increased. The duties on them [in St. Christopher's] were £1000 more in 1838, than in 1837; and in 1839, double those of 1838, within £150. This surprising increase is owing to the demand on the part of the free laborers, for imported goods, especially for articles of dress."

Again (p. 64);

"The average imports of the last five years of slavery [in Dominica] were of the value of £64,000. In 1839, they amounted to £120,000, although certain

vessels, which had been expected, had not yet arrived, when the accounts were made up;—the difference [in the year] in favor of freedom, £56,000; a sum which mainly represents an increase of comforts enjoyed by the emancipated negroes."

What does this mean? It means a great many things, which we cannot now stop so much as to hint at. Among other things, it means that the free blacks were able to pay for the large amount of property they imported, either from what they earned as laborers, or from business transacted on their own account. And, in either case, a full portion of the benefit of course inured to their richer neighbors. People do not get high wages without profit to their employers. Nor do they carry on an advantageous business without a proportionably high rent to their landlords. We commend this class of facts to the notice of any of our manufacturers, who may have given "an attent ear" to Mr. Secretary Walker's argument, and been willing to have Texas peopled with slaves.*

An illustration or two of this topic from facts nearer home, and we dismiss it. The rents of equally productive lands bear a pretty fair proportion to the density of population. Between 1830 and 1840, the increase of population in the Free States of this Union was 38 per cent; in the Slave States, it was 23 per cent. What made this difference? No reflecting person doubts that it was *Slavery;* and in checking the growth of numbers, it affected proportionably the rise of property.

Compare Kentucky and Ohio, contiguous States, of about equal area (Kentucky is the larger), and nearly equal fertility, the advantage, however, in this respect also, being probably with the former. In 1790, Ohio was an Indian wilderness, and Kentucky had 61,227 free inhabitants. In 1840 Kentucky had a population of 597,570 freemen (with 182,258 slaves), and Ohio of 1,519,467; and Ohio had a capital of seventeen millions of dollars employed in manufactures, which give an added worth to everything around them, and which (in all but the lowest branches, at least) every community must give up the thought of, which allows itself to employ servile labor. Cincinnatti, *above* the obstruction of the falls of Ohio, has 46,000 inhabitants; Louisville, below them, has 21,000.†

Compare New York and Virginia; the latter, in respect to merely natural advantages, the Paradise of America. In 1790, Virginia, with a great comparative accumulation of wealth, had a population

* It has been stated that, as long ago as 1843, the emancipated slaves of the British colonies consumed five times the amount of manufactured goods that they had done in slavery.

† In a letter received this month from an intelligent gentleman of Louisville, Kentucky, he informs us; "The most intelligent men of my acquaintance in this State are of opinion that, if slavery were abolished, the land in Kentucky would be worth, in five years after the declaration of emancipation, quite as much as both land and slaves now are." He adds; "There is almost no immigration to the State, owing to the existence of slavery."

of 748,308 on a surface of 70,000 square miles; New York, on her territory of 45,658, had 340,110 people. In 1840, Virginia had 1,239,797 inhabitants; New York, 2,428,921; while the estimated property of Virginia, in 1838, was $212,000,000; of New York, in 1839, $654,000,000.

Compare Maryland on her beautiful bay, with cold and stony Massachusetts; the latter has 98 free inhabitants to the square mile, the former, 27. Compare Michigan and Arkansas, regions open to emigration, received into the Union nearly together. The whites, in ten years before 1840, had increased in the respective ratios of 200 per cent. in the latter State, and 574 in the former. Compare Pennsylvania with the contiguous States on her southern border. Washington compared them, and he said that the difference between them was owing to the Pennsylvania laws for the abolition of slavery; "laws," he added, "which there is nothing more certain than that Maryland and Virginia must have, and that at a period not remote."

Yes, if our Southern compatriots wish to grow rich, let them take the effectual step of giving up that twelve hundred millions of dollars worth of men, which Mr. Clay said was too much for them to sacrifice.

NO. XXII.

WHAT SHOULD THE FREE STATES DO ABOUT IT?

In the first place, there are two things which they should *not* do.

1. *They should not meditate a severance of the Union of the States.* Disunion would be as evil a thing as it is painted by any of those, who, by dwelling exclusively on its evils, put their consciences to sleep in respect to that *Slavery*, which, as long as it exists, will threaten, more than all other causes together, to bring it about. The condition of two nations, related to each other like the sections North and South of the border line of slavery, would be of very different degrees of calamity to the two, but it would be such to both, as neither should entertain the thought of hazarding. This united nation, badly as in some respects it has begun, has a good deal yet to do in the world; a large space to fill in history; a beneficent work to accomplish for humanity; and it is not going to divest itself of the power by any such suicidal proceeding.

We of the Free States cannot consent to the losses and evils of separation, though no doubt they would be much lighter to us than to the threatening and blustering party. The South (or some of her madcaps for her) trembling for the security of her "peculiar institution," is plotting to get out of the Union, by sowing among

her ignorant population jealousies of their northern brethren; by extending Slave States to the Southwest; and by the adoption of California, helping her poor commercial resources with a good port on the Pacific within slave territory. But we cannot afford to lose her, and she shall not go. We cannot spare the brotherhood of the upright and patriotic non-slaveholders, who are destined yet to learn their strength, and wield an enlightened and salutary power within her borders. What is of less, but still great account, we must continue to have a way in and out of the mouths of the Mississippi. They are an outside-door of Cincinnati and Pittsburg as much as of New Orleans, and of Philadelphia as much as either. New York and Boston give and receive one tide of wealth across parallels of the Atlantic ocean, and another along the continuous track of iron road and western waters down to the Gulf of Mexico. Therefore the North, both East and West, must stop those long strides of South Carolina towards disunion, and California, if it ever gets admission at all, must come in without a slave. So said the *proviso*, introduced into the house of Representatives by the democratic Mr. Wilmot of Pennsylvania; and the people of the Free States, with a unanimity unparalleled for years, have responded their deep *amen*.

As to the most, and the worst, of the evils and disgraces of our connexion with slavery, disunion would be no reasonable remedy even for them; because, whenever the Free States should be in a condition to apply that remedy, they would be in a condition to effect the same object without any such strong expedient. Of course the Free States could not, under any circumstances, proceed to carry out a dissolution of the Union for the purpose of escape from the companionship of slavery, till there had been created among their citizens such a paramount sense of the intolerable nature of the evil, as would turn their political action vigorously in that direction. And when that was the case, there would be no occasion for any violent measures. The same state of things which rendered such measures possible, would render them needless. The Free States, by their heavy majority, would exercise the regular functions of the government. Their salutary legislation would at once efface some of the (to themselves) worst abuses of the atrocious institution; and the non-slaveholding interest in the Slave States, sustained and encouraged by the countenance of the central administration, and by the contagion of a lofty sentiment of public virtue beyond their borders, would probably not be very long in breaking down all of the abuses that remained.

Again; the Free States ought not to think of disunion, because it would separate them from their best auxiliaries in that work, which, for the safety of all parties, must be done. We want the help of the non-slaveholding white men of the Southern States, and they want ours, to throw off from both the burden of this insufferable wrong. To separate ourselves from them would be to leave

them in the hands of their hard masters, with far less hope of relief than that which many of them are now indulging. We and they have a just claim, in this exigency, to such aid as we can give to each other, through the action of our common government, and through the free communication of thought and purpose between fellow-citizens, on matters of high common interest.

Constitutional proceedings, then, alone are to be thought of, for the abatement of this monstrous nuisance. A disunion of the States, on all other accounts a calamity, does not change its character when viewed in relation to this end. But

2. *Neither are we to allow ourselves to be diverted from freely discussing* this great and vital question of humanity and of American politics, by senseless outcries of disloyalty or danger to the Union, or by vehement reproaches of any who may have hitherto discussed it with more or less of good judgment and good temper. The people of the Free States have now business far more important and serious in hand, than that of finding fault with abolitionists; and he who suspects others of favoring disunion, because they would expose the element of discord which makes the Union insecure, will do well, out of regard to his self-esteem at a future day, to revise his logic before he commits it to tenacious paper.

In his reply, last autumn, to members of the Anti-Texas Committee who had solicited his aid in furtherance of their object, Mr. Appleton, referring to a portion of the Abolition party, said, "I cannot sympathise with their cry of 'Accursed be the Union.'" What if he could not? Who asked him to sympathise with any such cry? Who asked him to do any thing more than help *save the Union from coming under a curse*, which, according to his avowed opinion, has since settled upon it? The gentlemen whom he addressed were each of them under an official oath, to "support the Constitution of the United States." The reflection upon them, as if they could intend disloyalty to the Union, was a fierce one. If Mr. Appleton's power had been greater, it would have been cruel. But the men at whom it was aimed are not unknown in this community, and they are able to bear it. There is no appearance yet that it has cost them any part of their share of the public confidence. They love the Union with an affection as warm as his own, and perhaps more considerate; and, because they love it, they feel bound to do what little in them lies to relieve it from its most shameful discredit and its most alarming danger.

Mr. Appleton said furthermore, by way of reply to an invitation to aid in multiplying petitions to prevent *the admission, by Congress, of Texas, as a Slave State, into the Union:*

"It is at least questionable whether the Abolition movement is reconcilable with duty under the Constitution. At any rate, that movement, as conducted, was calculated, in my opinion, to produce, and has produced, nothing but evil. It has banded the South into a solid phalanx in resistance to what they consider an impertinent and unjustifiable interference with their own peculiar rights and

business. It has thus exasperated their feelings, and, by its operation on their fears, has increased the severity of the slave laws. It has postponed the period of emancipation in the more Northern Slave States, which were fast ripening for that event."

Much of this appears to have been written in exceeding ignorance of the subject. Whether the Abolition party has done more or less that was right or wrong, few persons, we suppose, of as much general intelligence and information as Mr. Appleton, would now impute to it the production of just those mischiefs which he attributes to its agency. He must reason very differently upon well known principles of human nature from what we have been taught to do, if he really supposes that the slave is worse treated because the eyes of the whole civilized and Christian world have been sharply turned upon the master; and who does not know with what increased anxiety the Southern planter now pays to the better public opinion of the other portions of the country, the respect of insisting that his rule is a mild and generous one? To persons who have had opportunity to compare the recent physical treatment of slaves with that of ten, twenty, thirty years ago, nothing is more notorious than the fact of their improved condition in such particulars as those of food, shelter, and clothing. We have before us, in a pamphlet of some seventy or eighty pages, an account of Proceedings of a Meeting in Charleston, South Carolina, last year, "On the Religious Instruction of the Negroes." Is this step, taken after the outcry against the inhumanity of slavery had become loudest abroad, a token that the remonstrance of disgusted humanity had made the slave-holder more unrelenting, or on the contrary, that it may have done something to awaken reflection, or conscience, or shame?

The "Abolition movement," says Mr. Appleton, "has banded the South into a solid phalanx, in resistance to what they consider an impertinent and unjustifiable interference with their own peculiar rights and business." He should have said, it has banded *the southern slave-holders;* for, as far as it has had any influence, it has done any thing else but band with them, for that purpose, the other part of the white population. There are thousands in the South, who have been brought to see that *Slavery*, not efforts for its overthrow, is a very "impertinent and unjustifiable interference with their own *peculiar rights and business.*" And even when applied to the slave-holders, the remark needs much qualification. Cassius M. Clay and others would not *stay banded* in that phalanx. Many more consciences have been reached, than, under the pressure of circumstances, have as yet made their convictions or uneasiness known; and we and Mr. Appleton, without living very long, may live to see that Abolition is not the hoop that will hold the rotten cask of slavery together.

"It has postponed the period of emancipation," &c. So it is said, we know, by many persons in the South, while others entertain

strongly the opposite opinion. We incline to think that the latter are right, and that the charge, on the whole, is only a specimen of that species of popular appeal which "Salmagundi" used to call *slang-whanging*, set up as one of the methods of putting the movement in favor of liberty to rest. In that progress of sound views on the subject which has been going on in Kentucky, Maryland, and elsewhere, we see no indications, whatever Mr Appleton may do, that it would have taken place earlier, or developed itself more strongly, had the question of freedom never been discussed in the Free States.

"It has exasperated their feelings." In this statement there is much truth. But we draw a different inference from it. The hot, undignified, and imprudent exasperation of the slave-holders is to us a proof of conscious weakness, rather than of self-relying and determined strength. The South, in its childish fury, stamps on our petitions, bullies our representatives into silence, imprisons, whips, threatens to sell, perhaps sells, our colored citizens, insults and expels our white ones. Is not Mr. Appleton acquainted with that significant line of the poet Crabbe, "He put his anger on to hide his shame?" Is he not experienced man of the world enough to know that the stormiest protestations, and the most violent acts, generally proceed from a secret distrust of the goodness of one's cause? *Whatever God means to destroy, first he maddens;* so said very ancient wisdom. Slavery, on its way to be destroyed, it first demented with passion. We read in the holy book, that it was when the evil spirit was *about to be driven out* of a man, that it "tare" its victim, "and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming." So these violent demonstrations of slavery are the spasmodic contortions of the doomed and departing demon. It is while that unclean spirit is undergoing exorcism, that it plays its most crazy antics, and foams out the slaver of its imbecile and short-lived rage.

Such objections to the free utterance of the true and sober words of justice, humanity, and patriotism, have had their day. Neither facts nor good sense sustain them. An enormous moral, social and political evil exists, which must be exposed, calmly, but plainly and fearlessly, in order to its removal by peaceable and constitutional means.

In a sketch of the life of Knibb, one of the Baptist benefactors of Jamaica, we find some of the transactions between them and the planters thus summed up. "Knibb and his coadjutors came to an agreement with the planters, that Slavery and Christianity could not exist together; and there they parted. The planters said, 'We will exterminate Christianity'; the missionaries rejoined, 'We will abolish slavery.'" Our "planters" have come up to their part of a similar agreement with the free people of the North. They have insisted on saying, "We will exterminate *Liberty*. We will deny jury trials to persons claiming to be free. We will tread on your petitions in your national legislative halls. We will stop your mouths among us by panic or by shot. We will incarcerate, flay, and sell

your people." They have forced on us the necessity of replying, "We are not content with this arrangement, and therefore we will abolish *Slavery*. We will limit it, as far as we may legitimately do so, by the operation of laws, which our common Constitution permits us to frame. We will remove it ultimately,— we, or they who are to come after us,— by the force of reason acting on the minds of the rightful local authorities where it prevails."

NO. XXIII.

WHAT CAN THE FREE STATES DO ABOUT IT?

Some people, when they have pronounced these words, seem to think that they have given birth to an enormous witticism, such that the intensity of the labor dispenses them for the present from all exertion whatsoever.

I. One thing, however, quite clearly, the Free States are able to do, *by their own power in the national legislature alone*, and must do, if they do not mean to be an astonishment, and a by-word, and a hissing in the earth. They must put their foot down, and say, Slavery shall live no more in any Territory of this nation, and henceforward no State shall ever be admitted into the Union with a Constitution recognizing its existence. The disastrous Missouri Compromise must never more be repeated.

A most auspicious sign of restored sanity on this subject, in both parties of the Free States, was afforded by Mr. Wilmot's *proviso* to the Two Million Bill, which carried with it all but nine of the Northern Representatives, and, in the peculiar state of circumstances, would have had no bad chance in the Senate, but for a mischievous blunder in a quarter where it should not have been looked for. The South will move heaven, earth, and the shades, to drive us from that position. Sophistry, blandishments, bullying and bribery, will be dealt out in even unwonted profusion. But if there is a particle of ancient manhood left in the Free States, here they will be immovable. *Hic terminus hæret.* The time when you have taken your foe at disadvantage, and felled him with a stunning blow, is just the time to deal another, and despatch him. This the Slave Power well understands, and, having forced Texas into the confederacy, already talks of making its handful of people yield two more United States Senators by a division into two States. Will it be done? Already this is announced as part of the plan of the Washington campaign of this coming winter. Is there unfathomable scoundrelism enough among the Northern members to allow it to succeed?

If there is not in this Congress, there is a fair prospect that the time for it will have gone by.

II. There are two measures, *also matters of national legislation merely*, which the North absolutely requires *for its protection*, and which, though not capable of being carried through both Houses of Congress, by its own strength alone, are of such obvious necessity and justice, that, till obtained, it should never cease to insist upon them with a unanimous and peremptory determination.

1. One is, the repeal of that unutterably heinous law of February 12th, 1793, which makes the ears of every freeman that hears of it to tingle, providing that every American freeman's liberty, — his and his posterity's forever, — shall be at the mercy of any miserable town or county magistrate, whom the kidnapper may select, and dupe or bribe to do his accursed work. Pennsylvania and other States undertook to throw over their citizens the shield of a jury trial. But in the recent case of Prigg *versus* Pennsylvania, the Supreme Court adjudged that the United States legislation was paramount and exclusive, and that, though a man could not be wronged out of twenty-one dollars without the judgment of his peers, he might be, out of what is dearer than life. Freemen of the chainless Bay, of the free mountains of New England, of the free prairies of the West, do you believe it? Borrow the Statute Book; find the loathsome page; read the incredible words; and ask what your fathers fought for.

2. The other measure is, the opening of the Federal Courts to citizens of the Free States threatened with injury to property, person, liberty, or life, by the pseudo-legislation of the Slave country. If we were not restrained by our Constitutional union with the States which so insult and wrong us, we should not be long in righting ourselves. We gave up our own power of protecting the vital interests of our people, only on condition that they should be protected by the Federal arm. South Carolina warns away the free citizen of Massachusetts from a soil which he has as good a right to tread as her own proudest man. She seizes him before he has stepped upon the shore, and strips him for the lash, or sells him to life-long slavery under the hammer. She closes against him those Courts of our common country, where he would present his suit, and invoke the venerable arbitration of the Constitution and the Law. She threatens and drives away with gross insult the minister of the law who would plead his cause, himself as much privileged and as much outraged as the suitor. And finally, she makes it highly penal to ask for safety and justice within her borders.

Redress in these two essential particulars, though belonging to the province of the simple legislation of Congress, cannot now be obtained by the power of even the united North alone, because the Senate, in which half the voters are from slave-holding States, must concur in the passage of any law to repeal the Act of 1793, or (in

the words of the Massachusetts Resolve of 1845) "to extend by appropriate legislation the jurisdiction of the Federal Courts, so as to embrace and give redress in all cases of wrong done to the personal and commercial rights of the citizens of Massachusetts, secured to them by the Constitution and laws." But, in cases so clear, it is impossible that some Senators from the Slave States should not be found voting with us. It seems impossible that Senators like Mr. Clayton, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Crittenden, Mr. Morehead, men personally so upright, and representing States already so infected with free principles, should make up their minds to a perseverance in such impudent injustice.

But suppose they should, what then? Will the matter stop there? Only till men pursuing such a recreant policy shall be left out, and yield up their places to worthier successors; and this will not be forever. Their more right minded fellow-citizens will take care of that. At some rate, Congress must, it must see to these things. They make a matter of social life or death. The Courts of this Union must be open to the people of this Union. The poorest citizen speaks with a voice louder and more potential than the babblings of many Congresses, when he says, Clear the way for me into that Court-House, where the grave majesty of my country's justice sits, to hear the feeble, and decree the right. I have a right to enter, and enter I will, though all the roysterers in the South, and all the fiends below, obstruct. Clear the way, at whatever cost, till I stand right in front of the sovereign tribunal, and have a chance to tell my story. Do not answer me, that the door is beset by a South Carolina rabblement. That is no affair of mine. I care not, though there be twenty South Carolinas to the mob. You know best whether to bid your catch-poles coax or shove them aside. At all events, I say, *Make a lane.* I know my power, and will have my due. I am not one man; so hindered and wronged, I am clothed with a power that can crush to powder that of all men. High truths, attested by the world's experience, the manhood of universal man, the sanctity of eternal justice, they are the counsellors that stand by me in this presence, and they are not suitors that will take denial. Together, be sure of it, we shall make the world rock on its foundations deepest down at the core of things, but we will have our hearing.

III. There are two other measures, also matters of *national legislation merely*, which require to be adopted for the weightiest reasons of *public morality and public policy* regarding ourselves, as well as out of a becoming regard to the opinion of mankind; measures which should be constantly and strenuously aimed at from the present hour, in the hope that favoring events, and the growing sense of justice and humanity among our people, will before long allow them to be carried through.

1. One is the repeal of so much of the law of February 27th, 1801, as permits the existence of slavery in the District of Colum-

bia, the seat of the national government. Here we cannot throw off the responsibility of ourselves harboring the accursed thing. The government of the country, in which we of the Free States have our full part, is the local legislature of the District. And the District, *by the will and pleasure of the United States*, is not only a slave region. It is a slave jail and slave stall. It is little that there we flaunt our shame in the eyes of the representatives of Christian nations. We ought to do that penance for the sin; and, unlike the Coventry people when Godiva passed, they ought all to be staring and jeering from their windows at us. But it is a foul abomination that we, children of freedom's soldiers and martyrs, should set the police that guards the great slave auction of the country, — the den where, above all other spots, that wretchedness is piled and crowded, which belongs to the tearing away of men, women, and children, — helpless infancy, helpless age, conjugal attachment, — from partners, parents, offspring, brothers and country. Nor is even that the worst of our pet District. The little tiger's whelp loves daintier fare, and must have its occasional treat of a freeman. Every now and then one of our own free brothers gets within reach of its purveyors, and having been kept awhile in prison fatting, — or, it may be, thinning, — to see whether any body is going to call for him, *is sold to pay his jail fees.* The house that carries on slave-marketing on a large scale, drives a snugger business in the manufacturing way. "Know ye the land?" It is "the land of the free, and the home of the brave;" and the man-shambles and man-traps that we speak of, stand close by the dwelling of the writer of that melliflu-ous and satisfactory line.

2. The other measure of this class is the prohibition, by Act of Congress, of the Domestic Slave Trade between the different States of the Union.

The number of slaves annually sold from the more northerly Slave States to the South West is believed to be not less than forty thousand, yielding (as they are assorted lots) twenty-five millions of dollars. It is stated that, in 1836, the amount of sales from Virginia alone was twenty-four millions.*

The sale of forty thousand men, women, and children, is easily spoken of. It is despatched in a period. But what an untold and indescribable aggregation and complication of wretchedness does it represent! Each of those forty thousand was a father or mother, brother or sister, husband or wife, with heart-strings to be wrung by separation from kindred, and all that from infancy had been loved. The Foreign Slave Trade is infamy unredeemed. He who sells or buys a negro to be carried from Guinea to Louisiana is a pirate by the law of the civilised nations. When we catch him, we hang him, and his name, being that of the wicked, rots. What is the difference between the man who sells from a Guinea barracoon, and

* The "Virginia Times," as quoted in "Niles's Register."

from a Virginia plantation? What is the difference between the master of the slave ship, and the driver of the slave caravan? What is the difference to the poor outcast sufferer, whether he is transported by sea or land? In one respect, we own, there is a difference in favor of the latter. He is spared the terrible tortures of the *middle passage*, though even in this particular, if the truth is told, the advantage is not so great as might at first sight appear, for the hardships are extreme under the convoy of the land pirate, and a large per centage of deaths take place. And in another respect, the balance is all the other way. Compared with the savage Guinea native, the Virginia negro is a being of sensibility and refinement. His domestic affections are more human. His home (harsh home as it has been) is dearer. How is it that the nation so proudly and talkatively virtuous about the Foreign Slave Trade, is so easy and content with the Domestic?

It is not for want of Constitutional power to carry out the principle to the other application which the principle equally demands. "Congress," says the Federal Constitution (Art. I. § 8), "shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, *and among the several States;*" and it was under the former clause of this provision that it made the *African* Slave Trade to be felony. It has the same right over the *Domestic.** It has recognized the existence of the right by a practical use of it. By the Act of March 2, 1807, masters of vessels, under forty tons burden, are forbidden to transport coastwise from one port to another in the United States any person of color to be sold or held as a slave, under the penalty of $800 for every such person so transported; and by other cogent restraints the power of control is assumed and made operative. The rightful power that could interdict their conveyance in the smaller craft, could interdict it equally in vessels of any tonnage. Again, says the Constitution (Ibid. § 9), "The *migration*, or importation of such persons as any of the *existing* States shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight," — the clear implication being of a power, after 1808, to prohibit *migration*, which has not yet been done, as well as to prohibit importation, which has been; and a clear implication, further, of a power to prohibit either emigration or importation *at any time*, either before or after 1808, into any States not existing in 1788.

Is it said that great practical difficulty would attend the execution of a law prohibiting the interior migration, because it passes through a slave region, interested in its continuance? There might be. But the mere assertion of the principle and rule by Act of Congress would be itself of vast importance. The migration too passes

* A memorial from Boston to Congress, in 1819, urging the exercise of this right, bore the names, among others, of Daniel Webster, George Blake, Josiah Quincy, James T. Austin, and John Gallison.

through Maryland, Western Virginia, and Kentucky, where there are many friends of freedom, who would of course be friends to the execution of such a law. It passes down the Western rivers, by the ports of the Free States of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois. Whenever, by happy fortune, a poor fellow so illegally dealt with, should afterwards escape to a place where law prevailed, he could assert a legal right to his liberty. And singularly enough, it seems that we might expect aid in carrying through such a law from the very central focus of the Slave Dominion. The same policy which is leading Alabama by its legislation, and has led Mississippi by its Constitution, to prohibit the immigration of slaves within their own borders, might be expected to incline them to prohibit the emigration out of the borders of the other States.

The effects of such a provision would be of the utmost value. It would efface one of the saddest features of the institution, by permitting the poor black to live his life out among his friends, and on his native soil. It would lay the axe at the root of critical questions with humane and enlightened foreign powers, like the questions of the Enterprise and Creole. And indirectly it would strike a fatal blow at the continuance of slavery in the northern region of the slave country. Slaves are already of little or no value in Virginia, except as stock raised for a foreign market. There would be no more use for a million of slaves in Virginia than for a million of horses in Vermont. A fifth wheel to a coach would be scarcely less serviceable; and, besides, the wheel would not eat. "Nowhere in the farming of the United States," said Mr. Clay, in a speech to the Kentucky Colonization Society, as long ago as 1829, "could slave labor be generally employed, if the proprietors were not tempted to raise slaves by the high price of the Southern markets." The masters would be forward enough to quit themselves of the incumbrance at home, when they could no longer make merchandize of it abroad.

We care not to pursue this subject further. Possibly the time may come, when the Free States will inquire, whether, under the constitutional recognition of slavery by the old Thirteen States, original parties to the compact, or in any other way, slavery ever acquired a legal existence within the territory, afterwards introduced, of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri; and whether the nation is true to its solemn guaranty to South Carolina of "a republican form of government," when more than one half of her people is under the despotic sway of the rest. If interpretations of the compact, to which such questions might lead, should at first view seem bold, it is quite clear that they would not be of greater latitude than that which admitted Texas. But we hope that before they shall be raised, the evil which they might be designed to remove will have been quietly abandoned by the parties most interested in its fate.

NO. XXIV.

WHAT MUST THE FREE STATES DO ABOUT IT?—WHAT MUST MASSACHUSETTS DO?

THE partial reply to the former of these questions, attempted in the last number of this series of papers, was confined to particulars in which relief might be obtained by acts of national *legislation* merely, without the need of any modification of the organic law. There are other particulars, in which it is the Constitution itself that imposes the burdens we groan under. The framers of that instrument, erroneously supposing that Slavery was not to grow, and that it was soon to die, for the sake of union allowed certain immunities to the institution, which, could they have anticipated its future expansion and mischiefs, they would sooner have perished than permitted.

But, in their calm wisdom, they foresaw that experience might reveal defects in their frame of government, and they carefully provided a peaceable method for introducing such emendations as time might show to be needful. Nothing is more prominent in the Constitution than its self-correcting power. Evils which disclose themselves, and which cannot be corrected under its exising provisions, it directs to be redressed by alterations in it; and the time may not be so distant as to most it now appears, when certain onerous liabilities under which we labor may be thrown off by means of the Constitutional provision for amendments. At all events, whether that time is nearer or more remote, depends simply on the will of the non-slave-holding voters of this Union, who are to the slave-holding voters in the proportion of thirty to one, and who, in every individual State, constitute an immense majority. And this fact, that *the will of the voters* can immediately give a practical decision even in the most difficult and unmanageable case which belongs to the whole subject, is a justification, and a motive, and a demand, for the most energetic and persevering exertions to enlighten and move the public mind.

The cases of hardship, from which, as long as slavery exists, nothing short of amendment of the Constitution can give relief, are two. The first relates to the distribution of political power. As the constitution has been used and abused, fourteen slave States, with an aggregate free population equal only to that of the two free States of New York and Ohio, send to the Senate of the United States 28 members, and to the House of Representatives 76, while those two States have together but four votes in the upper House, and 55 in the lower. And in the Electoral Colleges the same amount of free population which in those fourteen States casts 104 votes

for President and Vice President, has in New York and Ohio only 59,—seven more than half the number.

The second case is that of fugitive slaves, who, if they escape into a free State, must, by the Constitution, "be delivered up on claim of the party to whom their service or labor may be due." The obligation is, to the last degree, revolting and offensive. Recent expositions of the United States' Supreme Court, of which some of the States have availed themselves by making it highly penal for their magistrates to have part or lot in the matter, and decisions of the State Courts affirming the freedom of the slave brought by his master within their jurisdiction, have greatly limited its applications as they were formerly understood. And so unanimous are the people getting to be about the iniquity of the transaction, that the provision has nearly lost its sting, except as an insult to their moral sense. It is true it is not lawful to kick the slave-hunter through and out of the free States, but it is perfectly lawful to refuse him a bed, a dinner, or a coach, and to hold one's tongue as to the whereabouts of his intended victim. The stout Quaker could not, in conscience, knock down his pert assailant, but there was nothing to prevent his holding him very hard.

Constitutional amendments, which may be remote, and redress by simple legislation, which may be near at hand, are both to be aimed at by acting on the public opinion of the country. The Free People of these United States are the constitutional constitution-menders and law-makers. If the evils which have now been commented on,—at much greater length than was contemplated when the task was undertaken, yet with much less fulness of argument and illustration than might have been profitable,—if these evils are shameful and monstrous, then it is the part of just and patriotic men, disregarding the passions and interests of the hour, the clamor of the wicked, and even the coldness and distrust of the good, to endeavor to move the people to their overthrow, with the honest voice of truth and reason.

But Congressional *legislation* is to be what Senators and Representatives in Congress shall will it to be; and the Slave influence in Congress, though ostensibly in a decided minority in one House, has hitherto had a most baleful influence in determining that will, by a skilful use of the patronage of the government, and by playing off against each other the parties in the Free States. The prospect of a foreign embassy, of an Executive department, and other prospects higher, and others yet much meaner than these, have too often proved powerful to sway the representative of freemen from the upright but not gainful line of fidelity to the honor and interests of his constituents. Many a northern delegate who has gone from home, seemingly as stubborn and immovable as the mountains that reared him, has not breathed the air of Washington more than long enough to find that he has talents for rising, and to show to the liers in wait that he is worth securing, before he has begun to be

bewildered by visions of "*my* prospects as a public man," a phrase heard for the first time (at least in New England) not many years ago, and one that has marvellous power to confound his perceptions of official morality, and make him useless, or worse, in respect to all the highest purposes for which he ought to understand himself to have been sent. So that it has come to seem not as safe as could be wished, to depute any man from the Free States to the national councils, who at the same time has talent to recommend himself to the slave-administered national government, and who, for an indefinite period to come, would consent to receive promotion at its hands.

The Free States, if they would make an effort for rescue from this thraldom, must be more careful than they have been, to make sure of the character,—the principles, the firmness, and the objects,—of those whom they invest with this momentous agency of the share that belongs to them in the central administration. The slave-ridden South is perfectly true to itself in this matter. Sharply as the sham-fight of parties may ring and thunder, in this soft bond of amity all parties embrace. Whether the white or the red rose triumphs, the man chaired is without fail a stout champion of the despotism of the Slave Dominion. It is fully time that the Free should take their lesson of unanimity on the fundamental principle of social being, and take like care of the pretended object of their liveliest affection. But, alas!

> "While our tyrants joined in hate,
> We never joined in love."

Tariffs, Sub-Treasuries, and Distributions of Public Lands, are very important things. Parties at the North have disagreed upon them, and may continue to disagree. But the claims of justice and humanity, and the priceless worth of liberty, are things far more important, and upon these they profess to be of one accord. If so, it should be as impossible for any man to receive the trust of representing them in the sovereign halls of their country's legislation, who does not hate slavery with a deadly immitigable hatred, as it is, as yet, for any man to receive that trust at the South, who does not roll the poison as a sweet morsel under his tongue.

When the Free States have mustered their honest strength, and displayed their long columns, marshalled for the right, in the House of Representatives, they will not look long to see the bug-bear impediment in the other House give way. In that progress of opinion which has auspiciously begun, it would not be half as surprising as many a political change that has happened in our day,—the event is by no means as improbable as the Annexation of Texas seemed four years ago,—to see the Congressional delegations of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky, in both Houses of Congress, elected by, and voting with, the non-slaveholding Friends of Amer-

ican Freedom. This may well come to pass, before those States shall be ripe for legislation in favor of emancipation within their borders. And the favor and confidence of the vast majority of non-slaveholders, North and South, when they have come to show something of their numbers and power in Congress, will nerve and encourage their allies in the afflicted region, and strengthen their efforts to upheave the giant evil.

But the way to bring this about, is not for freemen to be dumb, either in their own circles, or in expostulations with their brethren at the South. It is absolutely and demonstrably a common interest. We are their friends, when we entreat them to clear themselves and us from this four-fold curse, though they will not yet believe it; and by-and-by they will thank us,—they and theirs,—from the deepest depths of their hearts, for any thing we may have done towards opening their eyes to the hideous calamity and sin.

Meanwhile, a question for those whom these papers reach, is, What must Massachusetts do? She is a little Commonwealth, but still a great deal bigger in population, wealth, and all the better things that "constitute a State," than South Carolina, which so long has swayed, to such disastrous issues, the opinion of the South, and through that, the destiny of the nation. Massachusetts, small as she is, is marked by her history and by some other tokens, as the natural leader in the struggle for freedom. She spoke the nation into independence with the trumpet voices of her Faneuil Hall, and the sharper echoes of her Concord and Bunker Hill. It is her *mission* to lead the way in the redemption of the relapsed nation from a yet baser than its colonial yoke. She has filled New England with her great ancestral spirit. The homes of the nurslings of her generous breast stand thick upon the sward of Ohio and Western New York. The emigrant of the more distant West recounts, as his exiled heart's dearest treasures, the sacred lessons of her schools and churches, and will yet repeat them in tones to be heard and noted of all men. Call her little, if you will, when you are speaking words of ceremony. But call her great, as she is, when her responsibility is in question. Point to the page, bearing the record of what is honorable in this people's history, where her name does not stand in characters of light. Imagine the time when awful calamity and guilt shall have stricken down this nation, and when the first inquiry of the explorer of the course of past events will not be, What was Massachusetts doing in that crisis of ruin,—the land of the Carvers and Winthrops, the Otises, the Warrens, the Adamses, the Quincys? After her ages of glory, was she disgraced at last by a catiff inaction while shame and misery deluged the land, or did she keep her brave fame pure to the last by falling in the good fight, in the last ditch of liberty?

It is never worth while to deem meanly of the agency which occasion may demand from any community or any man. The greatness of the occasion imparts a greatness to the righteous and

steady act of the humblest. And Providence has not cast our lot in a dark corner. We men of Massachusetts of this age have a function, the accomplishment of which, for better or worse, will stand, long after moth and rust shall have corrupted all the factories and their fabrics, and the thief time shall have pilfered all this generation's heaps of gold. In the present momentous attitude of things, the world has an eye on the dwellers of that stormy coast which welcomed the forlorn but unconquerable fugitives of freedom in the seventeenth century; and posterity, after seventeen centuries more, will turn back with a blazing torch to search them and their doings out.

If we of Massachusetts do not fill our proper place, there is a prospect that others will, so imminent is the occasion, and so widely is already a free spirit kindled. Perhaps, for the moment, New Hampshire and Maine are stepping in a little before us. It has not been our practice to allow them to be bearers of the standard, but if we do not mean that they should now be, it is time to be grasping it with our own hand, and passing to our place in the van. Vermont and Connecticut, and the great North West, are looking to see how we demean ourselves at this juncture, and to honor us with a place in their leading, or to leave us out and behind, according as we are recreant or true.

But true we shall be, without fail. They stupidly misjudge the people of Massachusetts, who think that they can marshal her parties, and carry her votes, and at the same time bid her be laggard and neutral while a great work of virtue and patriotism is going on. Her people love thrift. They ought to love it. But they who, at home or abroad, think to govern her through that impulse, have not read the primer of her history; they have not learned the alphabet of her character. There is a high prevailing integrity among her people. Nothing moves them like a great moral principle. At the last fall elections, forty thousand voters, more than a quarter of the whole number, stayed at home. Why did they so? All sorts of political *isms* were rife. Why were they so? Because there was wanting a sufficiently strong moral bond of union in the old organizations. In great part because, on the foremost moral and political question of the age, one of the leading parties was rotten to the core, and the other was not thought sufficiently its opposite. The rejection, by last winter's Senate, of Mr. Wilson's Resolves, occasioned grief and offence to numbers. That error must be somehow retrieved, or the mutual confidence that has subsisted has received a well-nigh fatal wound.

There is a great deal to be done, North and South, before the magnificent idea of the authors of the Declaration of Independence, and of the Constitution of the United States, shall be realized. But they who are looking up to that accomplishment are cheered by all good omens. They have that which in antiquity was thought the best; "the best of all omens is, to be

struggling for our country." They have that of the sympathy and good wishes of all civilized and Christian men beyond the sea. They have that of the invincible vigor of truth and righteousness. They have that of the smile of the omnipotent God of justice and love.

We have brought our own humble task to a close. In parts it has been a harsh and painful one, though not without its satisfactions in expressions of the approbation of good men. May He, whose favor is light and strength, prosper the poor endeavor! It was for a great purpose, and it was well meant, however feebly executed.